CHRISTUS COMPROBATOR

C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D.

John B. Graber

John B. Graber,
Buffalo Mo.
1923

John Graber



Christus Comprobator

OR

The Testimony of Christ to the Old Testament

Seven Addresses

BY

C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D.

Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

WARREN A. CANDLER, D.D., LL.D.

One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South

NASHVILLE, TENN.
DALLAS, TEX.; RICHMOND, VA.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
LAMAR & BARTON, AGENTS
1922

PREFATORY NOTICE.

THE following Addresses form portions of a Charge delivered very recently to the Clergy and Laity of the Archdeaconries of Gloucester and Cirencester.

As the object of the Addresses is stated fully in the opening portion, no further comment is here necessary. In the great controversy that has now been evoked in reference to the trustworthiness of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, few will deny that it is desirable that both sides should fairly be heard.

C. J. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

GLOUCESTER,
November, 1891.

CONTENTS.

		Page
	Introduction to the American Edition . . .	7
I.	Introduction	11
II.	The two Theories	36
III.	The two Arguments	60
IV.	The Appeal to Christ	84
V.	The Lord's teaching as to the Law . .	111
VI.	Our Lord's references to History and Prophecy	137
VII.	Conclusion	164

INTRODUCTION TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

THE Holy Scriptures, especially the books which compose the Old Testament, have been subjected in recent years to a corrosive criticism of the most destructive character.

It is not new, but in our country it is just now more aggressive and arrogant than at any former time. It is accepted and defended even by some who profess and call themselves Christians, and on this account it is all the more dangerous.

While traces of the same sort of skepticism can be found far back in the history of Christianity, this destructive criticism began to take form in modern times under the leadership of a rather dissolute Frenchman, Jean Astruc, who lived during the period of 1684–1766. From him it passed into Germany, where it brought forth in due time the ruinous rationalism which has wrought so much evil in the religious, social, and political life of that nation, from which it has been transmitted with all its hurtful influence to other lands. Wherever it becomes prevalent it blights faith and withers piety.

In Germany it found advocates in such notable men as Ferdinand Christian Baur (who confined his attention in the main to the New Testament), and subsequently in Graf, Wellhausen, Kuenen, and others less famous, who have exhausted themselves on the criticism of the Old Testament.

Somewhat more than thirty years ago it became quite current in Great Britain, and a little less prevalent in certain circles of modish-minded theologians in America.

In opposition to it in England the learned and devout Bishop C. J. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, took strong position. The lectures which compose this excellent little volume he delivered to "the Clergy and Laity of the Archdeaconries of Gloucester and Cirencester," but their good effects were felt far beyond the limits of his diocese.

Both on the Continent and in Great Britain there has come in recent years a marked reaction against all this destructive criticism; but some in the United States who claim learning for themselves, and whose claim is allowed by very many people, including not a few preachers who are eager "to keep up with the times," seem not to have found out yet that it is on the wane. It is paraded in some pulpits and exhibited in some pretentious books, to the hurt of many who do not know that it is made up of the tattered remains of the cast-off works of Graf, Wellhausen, and Kuenen. We in America are therefore passing through conditions similar to those found in England when Bishop Ellicott delivered these able lectures.

It has seemed well to publish an American edition of the lectures to meet these conditions, and the British publishers of the volume have most graciously

consented to the making of such a publication. Accordingly the book is issued in the form in which it appears.

It is proper, and entirely just, to say that the discoveries in archæology made since the lectures were delivered in 1891 have not in the slightest degree impaired the force of the argument. On the contrary, the conclusions of Bishop Ellicott have been confirmed and strengthened by the latest explorations in Egypt, Palestine, and Mesopotamia.

The untechnical form in which the lectures are cast makes them especially useful to busy laymen and young preachers who are not prepared to deal with such subjects in any other form. But the most learned will find them not less worthy of confidence on this account. Men without technical scholarship will be able to grasp them with ease, and the most scholarly minds will appreciate them most highly.

They are republished in America with the hope that they may be followed by the same blessed results which they achieved in England thirty years ago and which abide to this day.

WARREN A. CANDLER.

ATLANTA, GA., *August 1, 1922.*

I.

INTRODUCTION.

THE subject which, on the present occasion, I propose to bring before the two Archdeaconries which it is now my duty to address, is the teaching of our Lord and Master as to the authority of the Old Testament, and the extent to which He authenticates the Divine origin and character of the different books of the Old Testament to which He was pleased to refer.

The reasons which have led me to choose this subject for our consideration will, I think, at once readily suggest themselves to all to whom these words are addressed. Independently of the sort of general feeling that the time has come when the discussion of such a subject cannot profitably be delayed, there are probably few of us who would not agree in the more particular conviction that recent circumstances have now made this discussion positively imperative, and of the most vital and urgent necessity. The Scriptures of the Old Testament have been often assailed: their historical trustworthiness has been denied; their statements in regard of the early history of the world have been impugned; the morality they teach has, in many cases, been denounced not only as imperfect, but even as in direct opposition to the teaching of the Gospel; their claim to be

divinely inspired, in any sense that would imply a qualitative difference between them and the higher productions of human thought, has been eagerly disavowed and rejected. With all this we have been long since familiar; but that with which we have not been familiar, that which calls out our present anxiety, and makes discussion imperative, is the strange fact, that views which appear to many inconsistent with what may be termed the historical trustworthiness of large portions of the Old Testament, are now advocated and commended to us by earnest Christian writers, of whom it is impossible to speak otherwise than with respect, and who, in argument, must be treated by us with all brotherly kindness and consideration.

This strange fact, it is right to say, can to some extent be accounted for. The criticism to which we allude would appear to be the outcome of an effort made by earnest Churchmen at one of our ancient Universities to remove the difficulties felt, it is said, by many young men of serious habits of thought and of cultivated minds, in reference to the Old Testament, its composition, its facts, its miraculous element, and its claims to be received as a divinely inspired revelation of the origin and early history of our race; and, more particularly, as a truthful revelation of the dealings of Almighty God, in past ages, with one chosen nation, and through them, directly or indirectly, with all the children of

men. The unhesitating belief which the Church appears to require, not only in the general teaching and pervading truths of the sacred volume, but in its theophanies, its miracles, and its prophecies, has been found, it is said, to be a stumbling-block of so grave a nature to young men of really religious minds, that some re-statement of the generally received view of the Old Testament has become absolutely necessary. It is maintained that the general interest in religion is far greater and more real than it was only a few years ago, and that unless we are prepared to see that general interest either die out or become merged in some form of philanthropic agnosticism, we must reconsider the whole question of the inspiration of Holy Scripture and especially of the Old Testament.

Whether this is a correct statement of the prevalent feelings of the more earnest and cultivated of the young men of the present day, or whether it is an unconscious exaggeration of what may be felt by a limited number of speculative minds with which the advocates of the new biblical criticism may have come more closely into contact, I am wholly unable to say. I come myself very closely into contact with young men of earnestness and intelligence; and, as yet, I have certainly met with no examples of the class in whose interest we are urged to reconsider our current views of the character and composition of the Old Testa-

ment. Four times, each year as it passes, I have the opportunity of contact with young minds; and up to the present time, I do not remember to have met with a single instance in which any serious difficulty appears to have been felt in reference to the Old Testament; nor have I been led to infer from what has been told me that doubts and difficulties as to that portion of the Book of Life prevail among the general class of the students at our Universities, to anything like the extent which, it is alleged, is now to be recognised.

I am, of course, well aware that those with whom I come in contact belong to a class that we may reasonably hope is but slightly, if at all, affected by difficulties as to the trustworthy nature of the Book that is afterwards solemnly placed in their hands. I am aware also that the information that I may receive from such a class as to the current opinions of young men at our Universities may be partial and inadequate; still I cannot resist the impression that the class, in the interest of which these novel views of the Old Testament have been set forth, is much smaller —at any rate at the Universities—than is commonly supposed. Under these circumstances I must be excused if I retain the fixed opinion that there are far better ways of dealing with the difficulties of these young men than by the unreserved publication of disquieting and precarious concessions.

It may be doubted, however, whether the desire to help the distressed faith of others has been the only motive principle in the publication of the essays which have given rise to the present disquietude. The writers tell us honestly that they were compelled for their own sake no less than that of others to write what they have written[1]. They avow themselves to be under the conviction that the attempt must be made to put the Catholic Faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems; and they distinctly tell us that if the true meaning of this faith is to be made conspicuous it must be disencumbered, reinterpreted, and explained[2]. The avowal is singular, and significant;—singular, as it would have seemed more natural to attempt to put these intellectual and moral problems into their proper relations to the Catholic Faith than conversely; and significant, as showing the direction and bias of the minds of the writers. Their conviction would clearly seem to be that the Faith, or, to put the most charitable construction on their words (for their language is not clear), the current Faith of the Church is that which must be operated on, and especially in reference to the authority and inspiration of Scripture.

Be the motive principles however of this at-

[1] *Lux Mundi*, Preface, p. vii. (ed. x).
[2] Ibid., Preface, p. vii.

tempt to disencumber and reinterpret the Faith what they may, this is certain,—that with regard to the authority of Holy Scripture and particularly of the Old Testament, the attempt has created in sober minds a widespread alarm and disquietude. And certainly not without reason. Independently of the precise nature and details of the attempt, of which I shall speak afterwards, the quarter from which what has been called the Higher criticism of the Old Testament originally emanated, and the plainly avowed principles of its earlier exponents, all combine in calling out anxiety, even in the minds of those who might not be wholly averse to a theology willing to put forth from its treasures things new and progressive as well as authenticated and old. The pedigree is certainly not satisfactory. This so-called 'higher criticism' of the Old Testament took definite shape some two generations ago. It commenced with Genesis and the earlier historical portions of the Pentateuch. In these it claimed to demonstrate the existence of earlier documents in portions which had been supposed to be the work of a single writer; and it called especial attention to many indications, of which but little notice had been taken, that the alleged work of the single writer had received additions at periods considerably later than the supposed date of the original work. If it had stopped here there would have been no serious cause for apprehension. But it went

much further. It proceeded to adopt criticisms which steadily tended more and more to disintegrate the inspired record, until, about half a generation ago, three writers of considerable learning and acuteness[1] brought to something like completeness this work of critical demolition. Ingenious theories were framed to support it, resting slightly upon language, but far more on internal arguments, until at length a view of the composition and probable dates of the books of the Old Testament has been commended to the general reader which, to use the most guarded language, is irreconcileable with a sincere belief in the inspiration, and even the trustworthiness, of several of the writings of the Old Covenant.

There is however one characteristic of this modern view of the Old Testament, as set forth by the three writers to whom I have referred, which must always steadily be borne in mind. And it is this,—not merely that this modern view tends to, or prepares the way for, a denial of the supernatural, but that it owed its very origin to the assumption that the existence of the supernatural in these early records is exactly that

[1]The three writers to whom I refer are Professors Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen. From the remarks of the last-mentioned writer in his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (p. 4, note, Edinb., 1885), it would appear that to Prof. Reuss of Strasburg must be assigned an important share in the early development of the question.

which wrecks their credibility. This perhaps is not absolutely stated in so many words, but it is impossible to deny that the preconception and assumption which runs through the whole of the particular critical investigations to which I am referring, is a disbelief in the possibility of the miraculous. Attempts have been made from time to time by eminent writers in our own country to show that the basis of the well-known histories of Israel and of the Religion of Israel is not really so naturalistic as it is assumed to be. But to this there is but one reply,—that almost every chapter of both these histories, and especially of the one last mentioned, will show either directly or by fair inference the futility of all such attempts. The basis of the histories and criticisms of the most eminent foreign exponents of the so-called Higher criticism is patently and even avowedly naturalistic. 'We have outgrown the belief of our ancestors' is the candid language of one of these writers, and certainly one who is not the least eminent among them. We thus do not deem it unfair to say that the whole system of Old Testament criticism, as set forth by some at least of these foreign expositors, is based upon rejection of special revelation, miracles, and prophecy,—in a word, the supernatural in all its relations to the history of the Chosen People.

Now in calling attention to this startling

characteristic of the majority of the best foreign treatises on this Higher criticism, I do not for one moment desire to imply that writers of our own country who may have, somewhat too freely, availed themselves of the results at which these writers have arrived, are committed to their views of the supernatural and the miraculous. Each writer must be judged by his own statements, and by the reservations he may make in accepting the conclusions of others. I suggest then no inferences as to the opinions of those writers to whom, in the sequel, I shall more particularly refer, but I desire, notwithstanding, to make plain, at the very outset, that disbelief in the supernatural has had a great deal to do with the development of modern views of the Old Testament. There is, at any rate, some such link between them as may at least suggest the greatest possible caution in assimilating results which have been arrived at under preconceptions such as I have described. This link there is; and it is my firm conviction that the obvious readiness with which these novel views of the composition of the Old Testament have been accepted by imperfectly educated or unbalanced minds is due to a practical, though it may be unrealised disbelief in many of the miracles recorded in the Sacred volume, and perhaps even in the miraculous element generally.

There is also another principle which, though

by no means of so dangerous a character as the rejection of the supernatural, has nevertheless produced almost equal effects in the shaping of theories as to the component parts of several of the books of the Old Testament, and in affixing to the books the dates that are currently assigned to them. And the principle is this,—to assume the existence of a continuous conflict between the schools of the Prophets and the Priesthood, and also of persistent efforts made, especially in the later periods of the history of the nation, on the part of the Priests and Levites to secure the supremacy. That there may have been, from time to time, strongly developed antagonisms, and that commanding figures like Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha may have provoked jealousies, and called forth opposition in what may be termed the ecclesiastical party, is perfectly thinkable, though, it must be admitted, the traces of such jealousies and oppositions between priests and prophets in their class-relations to each other are but few and shadowy. To assume however that most of the historical books were re-modelled, overwritten, or otherwise tampered with by the priestly party in consequence of these rivalries, is to assume far more than there is any sufficient evidence to demonstrate. Theories of a somewhat similar nature played their part in a past generation with reference to the New Testament. There

are some of us old enough to remember how books of the New Testament, about the design of which no reasonable doubt could be entertained, were regarded simply as the outcome of the controversies that arose between Judaizing and Gentile Christianity,—emergences from opposing schools of thought, and written manifestations of the vigour of Apostolic dissensions. These theories, we may remember, had their day, enjoyed for a time a partial popularity, and caused in many minds anxiety and disquietude. But now where are they? Cast away long since on the waste-heap of baseless speculations, exploded, and forgotten. And that such will be the fate of a large portion of those that we are now considering, in reference to the Old Testament, is certainly not a very hazardous prophecy.

But these two presuppositions are not the only manifestations of a bias which seriously affects the equities of argument. We may rightly note, in one of the three chief modern exponents of this Higher criticism, language of a tenor that seems very far removed from the tone that ought to mark all discussions of what is by a general consent regarded to be a record of God's dealings with man. Reverence it might be too much always to expect; but seriousness of tone, and, at least, some regard for the feelings of general readers might be ex-

pected from a writer of such recognised scholarship, learning, and cultivation as the author of the Prolegomena of the History of Israel. When for example such a narrative as that which we find in one of the early chapters of the First Book of Samuel,—a narrative in which Divine mercy is represented as a consequent on national repentance,—is described as 'a pious make up,' and set aside as not having 'a word of truth in it,' and when similar language is constantly reappearing, and fraud frequently imputed when the narrative does not harmonise with the general theory, we cannot but feel that we are dealing with a writer whose bias is antecedently so strong against the documents that he is analysing, that the impartial character of his criticisms and his conclusions may most fairly be called into question. The eager and scornful advocate takes far too much the place of the judicial critic in a work that claims to be an impartial setting forth of national history.

Prejudices and presuppositions then are distinctly to be recognised in this so-called Higher criticism of the Old Testament, and must have their due weight assigned to them in any estimates we may form of this criticism. It is too commonly assumed that all the prejudices and presuppositions are only to be found among those who disallow its conclusions. Prejudices and presuppositions on such momentous sub-

jects as those we are now considering will be found distinctly on both sides. They will continually show themselves on the most impartial pages, and will often vitiate what might otherwise be equitable and even persuasive conclusions. Against all such presuppositions it will be my duty in these Addresses constantly to be on my guard, and more particularly so as we pass onward into the more serious phases of the great questions that will come before us in the present discussion.

And yet I must here frankly admit that with every effort and desire to write with the most scrupulous impartiality, it will be very hard to avoid, from time to time, myself manifesting the very bias which I am here deprecating. The very nature of the argument that forms the substance of the Addresses almost necessarily carries with it a tendency to pre-judgment which it will be almost impossible to resist. How far Christ authenticates the Scriptures that speak of Him,—which is the main question proposed to be answered in these Addresses,—is a question which can never be answered without the constantly recurring danger of over-claim, and so ought never to be applied to particular cases that have not been considered beforehand with the most scrupulous care. The whole validity of the final conclusions will turn upon the choice of the passages which are supposed to contribute answers to the general question, and upon the equity and impartiality with which

they are discussed. In pointing out, then, prejudgments in the case of those we criticise, we are bound not only to exercise the utmost vigilance in avoiding them ourselves, but also distinctly to recognise the liabilities to bias which the very tenor of the particular form of argument will be certain to introduce.

It may, however, be just said in passing that it is fairly open to question whether the liabilities to bias are not quite as dominant in the working out of theories of disintegration as in the use of authority in countervailing them. There is a fascination in a destructive argument, especially when it necessitates ingenious elaboration, possibly quite as potent as any that may be found in the simpler and less personal process of traversing it by an appeal to One whose judgment, when expressed, must be accepted as ultimate and irreversible. There is quite as much tendency to bias in one case as in the other. But to proceed.

Thus far we have confined our thoughts to the chief sources from which the new criticism has emanated, and to the general characteristics which this criticism very distinctly reflects. We have thus far alluded mainly to the three foreign writers whose names are most closely connected with the reconstruction of the literary history of the Old Testament; and we have named the apparent presuppositions on which, consciously or unconsciously, they have executed their work. We

now turn to those with whom we are more particularly concerned,—the eminent writers in our own country who have adopted, with more or less reservation, the results which these foreign writers have arrived at, and who are now commending to the serious attention of English Churchmen some modified, but still very disquieting conclusions. On these conclusions, and on the general course of the argument which must be followed in regard to them, we will now make a few preliminary comments.

It is, however, somewhat difficult from the present state of the case to do this with perfect clearness and impartiality. Our English representatives of the new school of criticism are not, as yet, completely agreed among themselves as to how far they are prepared to accept the results on which foreign critics appear to be unanimous; nor again is it perfectly clear what particular conclusions, which the majority have accepted, have caused the widely-spread disquietude which, there can be no doubt, does exist among English Churchmen at the present time. We seem therefore obliged, in order to arrive at an equitable judgment on these points, and properly to understand the precise state of the complicated controversy, to feel our way towards some sort of standard, by means of which we may more correctly estimate the true nature of current opinion on the Old Testament. It will be desirable, therefore, to arrive at some agreement as to what

may be considered the generally received view of the age and authorship of those Books of the Old Testament that have been more particularly the subjects of controversy. We shall then have some kind of standard to which reference can be properly made; for the mere general term 'the traditional view,' as frequently used by writers on these subjects, is far too vague and too diversely understood, if left undefined, to be made any use of as an available standard of comparison.

We must begin then by defining as clearly as we can what is meant by this general term, and in what sense it is generally used by writers on the Old Testament. The following would seem to be a rough, but substantially correct statement. By the Traditional view we commonly understand the view that has been generally maintained in the Jewish Church, and also in the Christian Church; and which may be expressed in the following terms, viz. that the Books of the Sacred volume, in its historical portions, have been written or compiled, from contemporaneous documents, by a succession of inspired writers beginning with Moses and ending with Ezra and Nehemiah.

But here it is obvious that something more precise is needed if we are to have anything like a standard with which other views can be compared; it being frankly admitted that, in the general estimate of the nature of the contempo-

raneous documents and the manner in which they have been dealt with by the succession of inspired compilers, modern investigation and, it is fair to add, modern criticism have introduced some changes and rectifications. As this rectified view is the standard towards which we are feeling our way, our first care will be to set forth the Traditional view with those rectifications introduced which our present state of knowledge has enabled us to make. We shall then have a fairly defined standard; and in using, as we shall have frequently to do, the term Traditional view, we must be understood as always meaning the Traditional view in its rectified form.

In the second place it will be necessary to set forth clearly, in a similar manner, the results of modern criticism, and to sketch out the general estimate that has now been formed of the leading historical Books of the Old Testament by foreign critics, and especially by those foreign writers to whom we have already alluded.

In the third place it will only be just carefully to specify the extent to which the views of these foreign writers are actually accepted by the English Churchmen with whom we are here more particularly concerned. We shall thus have clearly before us what, according to these writers, we are to be considered at liberty to believe as to the origination of the Books of the Old Testament. It will then lastly become our duty to consider, closely

and carefully, whether this enlarged liberty of belief can be reconciled with the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ, as set forth in the Gospels, so far as it bears upon the trustworthiness and authority of the older portions of the Book of Life.

We have thus before us a two-fold work. In the first place we shall have to institute a careful comparison of the rectified Traditional view of the Old Testament with the view of modern criticism, which it will be convenient to term the Analytical view,—the term 'analytical' being apparently the truest descriptive epithet of this newer, or so-called Higher criticism of the Old Testament, and having the advantage of not suggesting any pre-judgment as to the worth and validity of the system. In equitable controversy nothing is of greater importance than the choice of terms, in the description of the views of opponents, which correctly characterise, but, in regard of any expression, favourable or the reverse, are as far as possible colourless. The terms 'traditional' and 'analytical' seem fairly to fulfil these conditions, and it is under these terms that we shall institute the comparison.

It must be observed, however, that the comparison of these two views can only, in Addresses like the present, be of a broad and general character. To enter into minute details or to analyse the separate reasonings, often highly technical and complicated, on which some of the results of the

Analytical view of the Old Testament are perhaps over-confidently based, lies beyond the scope of our present endeavour. It is a work, however, that I trust will be undertaken by some competent scholar; for in the study of these subjects nothing has more impressed itself upon me than the unwarrantable nature of many of the assumptions on the Analytical side in the discussion of these argumentative details, and the obvious bias with which the discussion has been conducted. That bias, I need scarcely say, is the bias against the supernatural, which frequently seems to permeate and modify the whole tenor of the criticism. It is of the utmost importance that this last-mentioned characteristic should always be clearly borne in view. The obliteration or, at the very least, the minimising of the supernatural is too plainly the principle, avowed or unavowed, that influences or conditions the whole of the more advanced Analytical investigation of the Old Testament.

When this comparison between the opposing views has been fairly made, the second part of our work will then commence. With the two competing views clearly before us, we shall proceed to make our appeal to Christ and to His teaching, as to which of the two views is most in harmony with the Lord's general teaching as to the relation of the Old and New Testaments.

But, alas, it will be necessary for us, first, to justify such an appeal; and, next, to show that

the appeal is made to an infallible Judge, and to One whose judgment, when it can be shown clearly to be intimated or given, must be accepted as final, whatever Analytical criticism may presume to say to the contrary. This judgment we shall endeavour to obtain in reference to the Law and the Prophets, or, to speak more precisely, in reference to the earlier portions of Scripture which include the Mosiac law, and the subsequent portions, whether historical or prophetical.

We shall then, lastly, review the whole argument, and endeavour to show that those with whom we are more particularly concerned, English Scholars and Churchmen, have gone much too fast and much too far in their concessions to the so-called established results of the modern criticism of the Old Testament. This criticism, as we have seen, is of foreign growth. It is distinguished by great acumen, and almost boundless self-confidence. When it tells us, for example[1], that 'the exegesis of the writers of the New Testament, in reference to the Old Testament, cannot stand before the tribunal of science, we see the lengths to which men, in many respects earnest and truth-seeking, are hurried by their convictions of the correctness of their own hypotheses; how all sense of proportion seems to be lost; and how vitally necessary it is to test these over-confident asser-

[1]See Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, p. 487, (Transl.), Lond. 1877.

tions, and to ascertain for ourselves how far these views of God's Holy Word can be deemed to be compatible, either with the results of fair reasoning, or with the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ.

How writers of the high tone and Christian earnestness which obviously characterise some of the English exponents of the Analytical view of the Old Testament, can have been led to advocate some of the conclusions which will be set forth in the investigations that will follow, is by no means easy to understand. If it be to help the weakened faith of younger men in some of the forms of the supernatural that present themselves in the Old Testament,—if it be intended to alleviate the difficulties they may feel in accepting such miraculous incidents as those related in the earlier portion of the Book of Genesis, or in the history of Jonah, —then, however well-intentioned such aid may be, no worse form of giving it could really have been devised. And for this serious reason,—that, say what we may, reason as we may choose, we shall never obliterate the conviction that there is such a close and organic connexion between the Old Testament and the New Testament, that whatever applies to the one, in regard of acceptance of the miraculous, is also applicable to the other. If the supernatural is to be minimised in the Old Testament, will it be long before the same demand will be made in reference to the New? To safe-

guard the miraculous in the New dispensation, when criticism has either explained it away or attenuated it in the Old dispensation, will in practice be found to be utterly hopeless. It will be in vain to plead that the Incarnation involves a completely different state of things,—that the visible presence of the Creator of the world in the world He came to save involves necessarily ever alterable relations with that world, and makes possible and thinkable in the case of the Lord what in Elijah and Elisha would be incredible and unimaginable. Vain it will be, and utterly in vain; nay, worse than in vain. For the same spirit that has found irreconcileable difficulties in the supernatural element of the Old Testament, will ultimately challenge the evidence on which the Incarnation rests. And the more so, as all the age-long testimonies of the Old Testament, all the fore-shadowings, all the promises that were greeted from afar[1], all the sure words of prophecy, will have been explained away and dissipated; and there will remain nothing save two narratives which, it will be said, bear so patently the traces of illusion, or, at the least, of an idealism expressing itself under the guise of alleged facts, that the doctrine of the Word become flesh, the doctrine which is the hope, light, and life of the universe, will in the end be surrendered to the last demands of what will have now become not a distressed, but a ruined faith. When

[1]Heb. xi. 13.

that blessed doctrine is surrendered, the total eclipse of faith will have commenced, and the shadows of the great darkness will be fast sweeping over the forlorn and desolate soul.

It is simply amazing that these things are not realised by those who are now advocating, it may be in a modified form, views of the Old Testament which, at any rate, owe their origination to writers who frankly avow that the religion of Israel is regarded by them as simply one of the principal religions of the world,—nothing less and nothing more,—and is to be dealt with according to the principles of ordinary critical history[1]. Inability to accept the supernatural is the distinctive feature of the Analytical system; all its results patently disclose it; all its investigations consciously or unconsciously presuppose it. How modifications of such a system, or deductions that may be drawn from it, however cautiously and guardedly, can ever be used to help failing faith, especially in such an age as our own, is to me inconceivable. When the freedom of the Creator of the Universe to modify the varied evolutions of His own blessed work, to give fresh energies to secondary causes, and to interpose, in accordance with that law eternal by which He sustains and developes the energies

[1]See Kuenen, *Religion of Israel* (Introd.), vol. i. p. 5, Lond. 1874. On the general view of this able writer in reference to the historical books, see Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. pp. 371 sqq., Edinb., 1883.

of all things,—when all this is now, as it is, directly or inferentially denied, when the last foolish utterance on the subject is that belief in the supernatural ought to be regarded as a religious offence[1], is this a time for English Churchmen to make concessions in regard of belief in the miraculous incidents of the Old Testament? Is this a time to suggest that the narratives before Abraham may be of the nature of myth[2], and to regard as the dramatised work of an unknown writer a portion of the Old Testament which the Saviour of the world vouchsafed to use in His conflict with the Enemy of mankind[3]? Is this a time for such perilous concessions?

After what has been said, can it be longer doubtful that it is now our plainest duty to give up all such hopeless attempts of aiding shaken faith? Is it not the height of imprudence to make concessions which inevitably will only prove to be instalments of the ultimate surrender of the supernatural? Ought we not rather to try 'to lift up the hands that hang down, and the palsied knees[4],' by the quickening power of truth, patiently and sympathetically set forth, by the inherent persuasiveness of time-honoured beliefs, and by bringing more clearly home to young hearts the credibility of that Traditional view of the Old Testament, which,

[1]On this utterance, see two articles in *The Spectator* for May 9 and 16, 1891; pp. 655, 686.

[2]See *Lux Mundi*, p. 357. [3]See *Lux Mundi*, p. 355.

[4]Heb. xii. 12.

when properly set forth, will be found to have lost nothing of its old and persuasive vitality?

To this duty we now address ourselves, and, as has already been intimated, will proceed to place in contrast the rectified Traditional view of the Old Testament, and the Analytical view,—alike in its more extreme form, and in the modified form in which, unhappily, it has met with the approval and acceptance of learned and honoured writers from whom it is a pain to be forced thus seriously to differ.

II.

THE TWO THEORIES.

WE now enter definitely into a full consideration of those statements as to the Old Testament which are regarded by foreign writers of eminence and learning as fully established by modern criticism; and which, further, are said to be very generally admitted by writers and scholars who have made the nature and composition of the Old Testament their especial study.

We may ourselves admit, at the very outset, that there is an amount of accordance between foreign scholars and critics as to the general structure of the earlier Books of Holy Scripture, and even to some of the more important details, considerably beyond what we might have expected, when the differences of the points of view of the writers are properly taken into account. It is startling, for instance, to find a venerated writer like the late Dr. Delitzsch in accordance with Professor Wellhausen in many essential matters connected with the Book of Genesis, and to find coincidences of opinion in regard of some of the characteristics of the Pentateuch between writers as divergent from one another in theological principles as Dr. Dillmann of Berlin and Professor Kuenen of Leyden.

But we must not be unduly led away by these

accordances. In the first place, we have to deal with men who have many psychological characteristics in common,—great industry, unexampled patience in sorting entangled facts, singular insight into the true adjustment of complicated details; but, with all this, a rashness and precipitancy in conclusion, and, not unfrequently, a very discernible want of proportion in their setting forth of results and ultimate principles. If it be not insular prejudice to say so, we can hardly fail to recognise the absence of that cool common-sense which, in subjects such as those we are now considering, is a gift, a veritable *charisma*, which can never be dispensed with; and without which no amount of industry, no accumulations of learning, will ever ensure trustworthiness, or even verisimilitude, in the results ultimately arrived at.

In the next place, this must not be forgotten, —that there is a fascination in these investigations, in these excursions into the unknown, which exercises a very powerful influence over those who, from any reason, enter into them. It may seem to be due to the simple desire of arriving at truth; but only too often, if an honest analysis of mental motive be made, it will be found that the attractiveness of theory-making, and of forming some consistent view of perplexing phenomena, will account for much of the sort of contagious interest that is felt in Old Testament analysis, and will explain the con-

fidence that is felt in the development of this speculative criticism. It certainly was so, some three-quarters of a century ago, when the origination of the Four Gospels was the subject of the theological activity of the time. Sober writers were led into the most elaborate schemes of Gospel construction[1]. Coincidences of opinion were found among scholars of very different theological views; agreement was almost arrived at as to what was to be deemed the aboriginal Gospel, just as now we are assured, in regard of the Pentateuch, that the primal document,—the 'Source' as it is termed by Wellhausen,—is a discovery of modern biblical analysis about which no reasonable doubt can be entertained.

We must then certainly not place too much reliance on the alleged agreement of leading critics and scholars as to the composition of the early Books of the Old Testament; and most certainly we may pay little heed to the assurance of a recent writer on this subject that the modern development of historical criticism is reaching results as sure, where it is fairly used, as scientific enquiry[2].

[1]Readers who may care to see brief accounts of these bygone schemes will find them in the Introduction to Meyer's *Commentary on St. Matthew*, §4, in the still useful work of the late Professor Norton, *Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. i. pp. 239-315, London, 1847, and in the older Introductions to the New Testament.

[2]*Lux Mundi*, p. 357.

But it will be well now to enter into details, and to proceed to place these alleged certitudes in contrast with that Traditional view of the characteristics and composition of the Old Testament which, with some modifications, has existed for two and twenty centuries; and which, we may very confidently say, will substantially remain to the end. Modifications there may be. Each age as it passes suggests, it may be, some rectifications. Each period of controversy like the present necessitates a closer study, both of matter and of language, and consequently a clearer perception of those details in which surer knowledge enables us to introduce rectifications and corrections. These modifications we may expect, but subversive changes in the estimate of the true nature of Holy Scripture, such as those which we are now invited to accept, will never enter into the *credenda* of the Catholic Church.

We begin, then, by defining what we mean by the term that we are using,—the Traditional view of the Old Testament. We mean that view of the contents, their authorship, and their trustworthiness, that prevailed in the Jewish Church after the final formation of the Canon of the Old Testament,—that is clearly to be recognised in the New Testament,—and has continued in the Christian Church, with but little substantial modification, to this nineteenth cen-

tury of salvation. Now, however, in the closing years of this century, we are told that this view must, to a great extent, be given up. We are in fact called upon to set aside the greater part of the beliefs of the past, and to see in the Old Testament a collection of ancient documents, many of highly composite structure, which came consecutively into existence centuries later than when they have been supposed to have been written; and which, after various re-editings and redactions, only received the form in which now we possess them, in the later, if not the latest, period of the Exile.

What general answer have we to make to these startling demands? Well, to begin with, certainly this,—that the view that we are thus, somewhat summarily, called upon to dismiss may in substance be recognised as dating from the time of the Apocrypha. We find in the writings of that period not only the same recognised divisions that were current in the days of our Lord[1], but a deliberate ascription of sacredness to the ancient Books[2], and especially to the Mosaic Law and to its author, into whose soul Wisdom herself vouchsafed to enter[3]. The Books of the Old Testament were apparently ascribed, as we now ascribe them, to prophets,—the term prophets

[1]Ecclus. i. Prologue. [2]1 Macc. xii. 9.
[3]Wisd. x. 16.

in the Apocrypha[1] being applied not only to men who 'showed what should come to pass[2],' and who spake 'from the mouth of the Lord[3],' but who were guided by His Spirit, and ranked with the 'friends of God[4].'

We may recognise substantially the same views in Philo, though in a more exaggerated form. With him the Old Testament is ever regarded as one divine whole, breathed through by the Spirit of God, one inseparably connected holy Word, of which the Pentateuch is to be accounted the crown and the glory[5]. The same views are expressed by Josephus, though in more restrained and moderate terms. He, too, regards the Sacred Scriptures as a divine whole. They were written by a succession of prophets, the greatest of whom was the inspired writer of the Pentateuch,—true prophets, yet with separate gifts,—some writing under immediate inspiration from God, others only truthfully and faithfully recording the events of their own times, though never without some measures of divine guidance and direction[6].

Such generally were the views entertained in the Jewish Church after the formation of the Canon

[1]See Bretschneider, *Dogmatik der Apocryph. Schriften*, §4, 68 sq.

[2]Ecclus. xlviii. 25. [3]1 Esdras i. 47. [4]Wisd. vii. 27.

[5]See Ewald, *History of Israel*, vol. vii. p. 204 (Transl.) London, 1885.

[6]See Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, i. 7, 8.

of the Old Testament; such the views in the time of our Lord; and such, though not without various modifications in detail, the views entertained by the early writers in the Christian Church,—the Eastern Church involving more of the speculative element, the Western more of the formulated and traditional. The broad principles that were maintained were the harmony of the teaching of the writers of the Old Testament[1], the organic unity of the two Testaments[2], the self-sufficiency of Scripture for the setting forth of truth[3], and its blessed and plenary perfection[4]. It is only in heretical writings, and particularly in the Clementine Homilies, that we find any traces of that kind of criticism of the Old Testament with which this nineteenth century has made us so painfully familiar. Even from early days controversy has prevailed in regard of the nature of the inspiration and the infallibility of Holy Scripture, but it is only in the last hundred and forty years[5], and particularly in

[1]Comp. Justin M., *Cohort. ad Graecos*, cap. 8, compared with cap. 7. [2]Comp. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 16.

[3]Athan. *Contra Gentes*, cap. 1.

[4]Cyprian (*Prolog. ad Test. adv. Judaeos*) uses the expression 'divinae plenitudinis fontes' in reference to the 'Scripturas veteres ac novas.'

[5]The commencement of the present Analytical system is referred by some writers to the French physician Astruc, who, about the time named, pointed out that the passages containing the name Elohim can be arranged in a kind of narrative form. See Ladd, *Doctr. of Sacred Scripture*, vol. ii. p. 240.

the last quarter of a century, that the broad principles of the Traditional view have been deliberately and even contemptuously flung aside, and the genuineness, integrity, and trustworthiness of the Old Testament impugned and traversed by the industrious ingenuity and really limitless assumptions of modern analysis.

This destructive criticism has, however, not been without its uses. It has at last compelled us to study more diligently and systematically the Old Testament. For a very long period the critical study of the Old Testament has been comparatively neglected by biblical scholars. The Hebrew language has to a great extent dropped out of the curriculum of modern theology; the critical questions that have been now brought to the front by men of singular acumen, as well as of untiring industry, come upon us with a kind of startling novelty; and we find ourselves, as it were, taken by surprise, and brought suddenly face to face with questions pressed upon us by experts, to which we are uneasily conscious that we can give no answers that can stand five minutes of steady criticism.

This state of things is, however, passing away. We are at length beginning to realise the gravity of the present state of the Old Testament controversy. The Traditional views are being re-examined under the light of modern discoveries; and efforts are beginning to be made

fairly to put in contrast that inspired and trustworthy record of the past bearing the name of the Old Testament, and sealed with a belief of more than two thousand years in its genuineness and integrity, with that strange conglomerate of myth, legend, fabrication, idealised narrative, falsified history, dramatised fable, and after-event prophecy to which modern critical analysis has sought to reduce that which our Church, day by day, calls the 'most Holy Word' of Almighty God.

Such a contrast we are now endeavouring to make in this Charge,—a contrast which it is believed will in itself go far to re-assure the perplexed and the doubtful, and will show what we must term the dangerous credulity of those who are advising us, for the sake of the shaken faith of young men at our Universities, to accept the leading conclusions of this revolutionary analysis. To strive to help failing faith is a noble endeavour, but there are limits to the extent to which that help is to be carried. Are we to have no thought for the countless numbers of those simple trustful believers who in the language of a modern poet, are leading 'lives of melodious days,' because clinging to the old faith, and accepting what Apostles and Evangelists, yea, and the dear Lord Himself, have expressly guaranteed to them? Are these babes in Christ to be forgotten? Are good and earnest men to be so over-eager for the

comparatively few, as to lose sight of those whose very salvation may be endangered by this precipitancy of literary credulity?

At any rate let us make our contrast. Let us state succinctly on the one side what we have termed the rectified Traditional view of the composition and authorship of the Old Testament, and, on the other side, the modern Analytical view; and then, further, those modifications of it which English Churchmen of earnestness and piety advise us to accept as helpful to weakened faith, and as that which, to use the words of one of these writers, may 'legitimately and without real loss be conceded[1].' Conceded, and to whom? To Eduard Reuss and to Graf, to Kuenen and to Wellhausen, and to their followers in this country who adopt, in a greater or less degree, their conclusions. When the contrast has been completed, we will, without entering into any technicalities, let common sense be brought to bear upon the contrast, and endeavour to make a rough but equitable estimate of the preponderance of the probability which the Traditional view may claim over the Analytical view, and the real insufficiency of the arguments on which this latter view appears principally to rely. This done, we will then make our appeal to far higher and more conclusive authority.

I. The rectified Traditional view may be con-

[1] *Lux Mundi*, p. 362.

veniently expressed under the following formulated statements.

We have full reason for believing,—

1. That the Book of Genesis was *compiled* by Moses,—in its earlier chapters from primeval documents[1] which may have been brought by Abraham from Chaldæa, and in its later chapters (except parts of xxxvi.), from family records of a distinctly contemporaneous origin, which we may reasonably believe to have been preserved in the families of the successive patriarchs as the archives of their race. That these should have been accessible to the divinely appointed leader of the race, himself a man of known learning[2],—that he should have arranged them and illustrated them by contemporary notes, is a supposition so reasonable, that, though no more than a supposition, it may be accepted at least as more plausible than any other which has yet been advanced.

2. That, of the four remaining Books of the Pentateuch, the first, the Book of Exodus, as the au-

[1]It appears now to be generally admitted that there may have been documents extant at the early date referred to, whether traced in a small character on brick tablets, or otherwise: see Lenormant, *Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient*, tome i. p. 18, Paris, 1881. See also an interesting article on early writing, *ibid.*, pp. 397-450; comp. Duncker, *History of Antiquity*, vol. i. p. 278 (Transl.), Lond., 1877. The cuneiform writing appears to have originally come from the Sumero-Accadians: see Lenormant, *ibid.*, tome iv. p. 30.

[2]Acts vii. 22.

tobiographical character of large portions of it seems clearly to indicate, was *written* by Moses, or, at least, under his immediate direction and authority. That the Book of Leviticus, as containing the statutes and ordinances for the most part expressly stated to have been revealed to Moses, must, if not actually written by him, have been compiled by authorised scribes under his immediate supervision. That the Book of Numbers, as containing more mixed material, may be considered to have been compiled,—in part from the legislative revelation made directly to Moses, in part from contemporary records made by Moses in obedience to God's command[1], in part from documentary annals including references to books[2] that may have been compiled during the lengthened abode in the wilderness,—but all, as the tenor of the whole Book, and its concluding verse seem distinctly to imply, under the authority and general oversight of Moses. . . . Finally, that the Book of Deuteronomy, containing as it does, not without notes of time and place, the addresses of the closing days of the inspired legislator (which we may regard as having been specially recorded and preserved by official writers[3]), assumed its present

[1]Numb. xxxiii. 2; see also Exod. xvii. 14.

[2]Numb. xxi. 14, 21.

[3]See Girdlestone, *Foundations of the Bible*, pp. 21, 24, Lond., 1890.

form, as one passage seems in some degree to suggest[1], under the hand of Joshua.

3. That the Book of Joshua, which is rightly considered by all recent critics as standing in close connexion with the Pentateuch, was similarly compiled by some contemporary writer or writers under the direction of Joshua,—in part, as the narrative seems to imply, from communications personally made by Joshua, and, in part, from documents and records made at the time by official writers and recorders, of whose existence and employment, even in those early days, we find traces in the Pentateuch.

4. That the Book of Judges is a compilation, not improbably made by the prophet Samuel, from contemporary records, family memorials, and other existing materials[2], commencing with events recorded in Joshua, and extending, though not in perfect chronological order, over a period of about 400 years.

5. That the Books of Samuel and of Kings are compilations consisting in part of the compositions of contemporary prophets, beginning with Samuel and with Nathan and Gad[3], and in part of selected materials from official records, sacred and secular, put together, and perhaps

[1]Deut. xxxii. 44.

[2]See Girdlestone, *Foundations of the Bible*, pp. 40 sq., Lond., 1890.

[3]1 Chron. xxix. 29.

added to by seers and prophetical writers[1], of whom Jeremiah was the last and, as he well may have been, one of the principal contributors[2].

6. That the Books of Chronicles were a compilation, possibly, nay, even probably, by Ezra, made largely from the Books of Kings, or from the documents on which these Books were based, but with abundant references and allusions to nearly all the earlier historical Books including the Pentateuch[3].

7. That the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah were written by the writers whose names they bear[4], and contain, in part, extracts from official documents and from contemporary records, and also, in part, narratives of personal history.

8. That the prophetical writings are written by those whose names are, in every case, specified in their writings, and that they contain, in some instances, portions of contemporary history, but that the main element of their writings is distinctly predictive, and has reference to events that belong to what was future and posterior to the time when they were mentioned by the writer.

[1]Comp. 2 Chron. ix. 29, xii. 15; xvi. 11, al.

[2]See Girdlestone, *Foundations of the Bible*, p. 35.

[3]See Girdlestone, pp. 56 sq.

[4]Girdlestone, p. 12; but see Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. pp. 546 sq., Edinb., 1883.

9. Lastly, that the historical Books, as we now have them, bear plain and unmistakeable marks of the work having passed through the hands, not only of the early compiler or compilers, but of later editors and revisers,—numerous notes, archæological and explanatory, some obviously of an early, and some of a late date, being found in nearly all the books, but particularly in the more ancient[1].

Such would appear to be a fair and correct statement of what we have agreed to term the Traditional view of the historical and prophetic Books of the Old Testament, modified as it now is, and, in some particulars, rectified, by modern research.

II. We now turn to the opposing theory, to which we have agreed to give the colourless epithet of 'Analytical,' as claiming to be founded on a searching criticism of the historical Books of the Old Testament, and especially of what is now called the Hexateuch (the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua) —these early Books involving the widest alleged divergences from the formulated statements which have been set forth in the foregoing paragraphs.

This Analytical view we will first place before the reader in the form now generally adopted by the most acute foreign critics of the Old Testament: we will then pass onward to notice the

[1]See especially, Girdlestone, *Foundations of the Bible*, chap. x, xi, pp. 66-81.

extent to which they have been accepted by recent writers of our own country and Church. The results that have been thus accepted will unhappily be found to be considerable; but the tone in which they are set forth is widely different from that adopted by the majority of the foreign critics, and is marked by a temperate and reverential spirit which, at any rate, shows some recognition of the momentous issues that are involved, and the influence they must exercise on the faith of the general reader of the Old Testament.

The results of the Analytical theory, as arrived at by the most acute foreign critics, may be thus briefly summarized:—

1. That the Old Testament did not assume its present form till a somewhat late date in the period of the Exile.

2. That the later historical Books, and especially the two Books of Chronicles, disclose methods of constructing history which justify the limited estimate that has been formed of the trustworthiness of the earlier Books, and prepare us for the inferences that have been drawn from a critical investigation of them.

3. That this critical investigation, in the case of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua (now usually called the Hexateuch), discloses at least three strata of narrative and legislative details, of different dates and distinctive peculiarities, which, after having been revised and re-edited,

possibly several times, have at last been not unskilfully combined in the form in which they have now come down to us.

4. That the three strata more particularly to be recognised are (*a*) a History Book,—itself composite, as both names of Almighty God (Jehovah and Elohim) are to be found in it,—dating from the period of the early kings and prophets; (*b*) the Book of Deuteronomy, compiled in the days of Manasseh or Josiah by some unknown writer, and having some slight affinity with the above-mentioned History Book; (*c*) a document, in its earliest state of perhaps the same date as (*a*), historical only in form, using throughout the name Elohim,—sometimes called the *Grundschrift* or Fundamental Document, sometimes the Book of the Four Covenants, sometimes, though misleadingly, the earlier Elohist,—which, after having been carefully revised, became expanded in the time of the Exile into what is called the Priestly Code, its basis being Leviticus and allied portions of Exodus and Numbers[1].

5. That the three codes of Law found in the Pentateuch conform to and corroborate this analysis.

6. That in the present Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, we have remodelled history,

[1]Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, (Transl.), Edinb., 1885.

and a repainting of the original picture[1] on a generally uniform principle[2], and with some reference to Deuteronomy[3],—the accretions and corruptions in the Books of Samuel being numerous, and especially where the prophet stands in connexion with the history of David[4]; and the revision of the Books of Kings being also very unrestricted[5], though closer to the facts than in Judges or Samuel[6].

7. That the Prophets used history as a vehicle for their own ideas[7]; and that their so-called predictions are only fallible anticipations of the manner in which, according to their conceptions, the Deity would, consistently with the character they ascribed to him, deal with the subjects of His government[8]; and this, notwithstanding it is admitted that all the writers of the New Testament, and our blessed Lord Himself, ascribe divine foreknowledge to the Israelitish prophets[9].

8. That thus,—to sum up a few leading results to which we are led by the foregoing statements,—we are to regard the Book of Deuteronomy as a fiction, founded it may be on traditions, and of

[1]Wellhausen, pp. 293, 294.
[2]Ibid., p. 277.
[3]Ibid., p. 280.
[4]Ibid., p. 267.
[5]Ibid., p. 272.
[6]Ibid., p. 277.
[7]Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy*, p. 444 (Transl.), Lond., 1877.
[8]Muir, Introduction to Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy*, p. xxxviii.
[9]Kuenen, p. 448.

no earlier date probably than the eighteenth year of Josiah; that the Tabernacle of Witness, or, as it is now commonly called, the Tent of Meeting, and everything connected with it, had never any existence except in the fabricated history composed in the days of the Exile, and that far from the Tabernacle being the prototype of the Temple, it was the Temple that suggested the deliberate and elaborate fiction of the Tabernacle[1]; and further, that the older books were remodelled according to the Mosaic form[2], and that Chronicles, especially, was falsified by Priests and Levites to sustain the belief that the tribe of Levi had been set apart from the days of Moses and that the Priesthood dated from that time[3],—such a belief being, it is alleged, utterly inconsistent with the truth.

Such, in brief outline, is the Analytical view of the Old Testament, a view which, I regret to say, has very many supporters, and in Germany is fast becoming the accepted account of the origin and formation of the earlier portion of the Book of Life. That such a view should meet with acceptance in any Christian country is sad enough, and startling enough, but that it should meet with acceptance to a considerable extent at the hands of members of our own Church is full of

[1]Wellhausen, pp. 37, 39. [2]Ibid., 294.
[3]Ibid., p. 126 note, 221, 222.

very sad augury for the future. But it is so. In a carefully written article by one of our University Professors, and in a portion of a recent and well-known collection of theological treatises, the substance of much that has been just specified has been adopted and set forth as a view of the Old Testament that may be consistently maintained by an English Churchman.

We are told, for example:—

(1) That the earlier narratives before the call of Abraham are of the nature of myth[1],—myth being defined to be the product of mental activity not yet distinguished into history and poetry and philosophy[2].

(2) That the Hexateuch owes its existence to three principal sources, viz. those already specified,—the composite History Book, sometimes called the prophetical narrative, Deuteronomy, and the Priests' Code; the first-mentioned being the oldest, the second belonging to the reign either of Manasseh or Josiah, and the third to the period of the Exile, when the laws, gradually developed out of an earlier and simpler system, were finally formulated in a complete and definite code.

(3) That the Book of Deuteronomy is a republication of the law in the spirit and power of Moses put dramatically into his mouth.[3]

[1] *Lux Mundi*, p. 357. [2] Ibid., p. 356.
[3] Ibid., p. 355.

(4) That the later historical Books are of a composite structure, and present to us the phenomena of older narratives fitted into a compiler's framework[1]; and, generally, that there is a considerable idealizing element in the Old Testament History[2].

(5) That in the Books of Chronicles we must admit unconscious idealizing of history, and a reading back into past records of a ritual development which is really later[3].

(6) That the predictive knowledge of the prophets is general, and of the issue to which things tend; sometimes, but not usually, a knowledge of times and of seasons[4], prophetic inspiration being consistent with erroneous anticipations as to the circumstances and the opportunities of God's self-revelation[5].

Such are the conclusions with regard to Old Testament criticism which English Churchmen are advising us to accept. Such the sort of compromise, if compromise it can justly be called, which those who stand in the old paths, and substantially hold the Traditional view, are now invited to make with those who maintain in its completeness the Analytical view, as it has been set forth in this Address.

Now, in the first place, let any fair-minded

[1]Prof. Driver, in *Contemporary Review* for Feb. 1890, p. 216.
[2]*Lux Mundi*, 354. [3]Ibid., p. 353.
[4]Ibid., p. 346; but see note, p. 345. [5]Ibid., p. 346

reader simply set side by side the six statements just made with the eight statements of the Analytical view made a little earlier, and then form his opinion of the relation of the two. And will it not be this? that the difference in tenor between the two groups of statements is slight; and that it is impossible to regard the statements of the English writers as otherwise than expressive of a general acceptance of the Analytical view; modified, it will be observed, in certain details, and minimised, to some extent, in phraseology, but, when thus modified, in no degree approximating to the rectified Traditional view, or to be regarded as a mediating statement between the two theories.

We have really only two views to place in contrast; but, in doing so, it will be only right and equitable to recognise that we are not justified in imputing to the English advocates of the Analytical view the extreme opinions which the foreign advocates can be shown, either by direct statement or by necessary inference, indisputably to hold. This, however, may always be said,—that the tendency of unbalanced minds, if they accept any modified view, to pass onward into the unmodified, is very patent. The real harm then that has been done by recent English writers lies in the plain fact that they have, though with the very best intentions, actually prepared the way for shaken and unstable minds to arrive at results which will

at last be found to involve inability to accept the supernatural, and so, a complete shipwreck of the faith.

These things are sad and serious, and do justify us in inviting these well-intentioned writers to reconsider their whole position, and to ask themselves whether they may not more profitably devote their efforts to a guarded rectification, where it may be needed, of the Traditional view, and whether these over-hasty excursions into the Analytical are not full of peril, not only to simple and trustful souls, but even to those in whose interest these adventurous excursions have been made.

But we must now proceed onward with our general argument. We have set forth, we trust fairly and correctly, the two opposing views, the rectified Traditional and the Analytical, and also the few real modifications that have been suggested in the latter. We must now put these views to the test, and give full and fair consideration to the two leading arguments which must influence us in our choice between the Old and the New Learning,—between tradition and critical hypothesis,—between historical supernaturalism and ultimately natural development,—between alleged facts and alleged myths,—between the leading features of the belief of the Jewish and of the Christian Church, and the investigations, confessedly acute and elaborate, of a few distinguished

scholars and critics of this last half of the nineteenth century.

These two leading arguments we will endeavour to develop in the next Address, and in those which will follow it. We will first make our appeal to the reasonable and the probable: we will then make that appeal which, if rightly made, must bring to a close all controversy,—the appeal to Him to whom the Old Testament bears witness, and whom the New Testament reveals,—to Him in whom dwell all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge[1], the Light of the world as well as the Saviour of the world,—the Lord Jesus Christ.

[1]Col. ii. 3.

III.

THE TWO ARGUMENTS.

We have now before us the two theories as to the composition of the Old Testament and its appearance in its present form. Both theories relate more particularly to the historical portions, and of these pre-eminently to the earlier Books, —as it is upon these Books and the inferences that appear deducible from their structure, that controversy assumes its most emphasized form.

Into this controversy we must now enter; but it can only be on general and broad issues, the critical discussion of details being out of place in Addresses of the nature of the present. All we can hope to do is to obtain a clear view of the two estimates that have been formed of the nature of the Old Testament; to weigh carefully the general arguments which may be advanced on either side; and finally to set forth clearly the reasons which may appear to justify us in accepting one, and rejecting the other of the two views of the Old Testament that have now been placed circumstantially before us. This is a case, it will be observed, in which there can be no compromise in any real sense of the word. Each view may derive some useful details from the mode of development adopted in the view to which it is opposed; some results arrived at by

the one may be accepted by the other, but there is clearly no common ground. On one side we have historical tradition, on the other literary criticism and analysis. Each must justify itself by its appeal to the facts and circumstances of the case, and by its claim to give a more reasonable and probable account of them than can be given by the other, and reason and common-sense must be the arbiters. It is, however, by no means easy, in such intricate and complicated questions, so to state the matter that issue may fairly be joined upon it, and the argument conducted in a manner that will be intelligible to the general reader. Still the attempt must be made.

Perhaps, then, the simplest mode of conducting the controversy will be thus,—to narrow the arguments by maintaining the truth of two propositions, the one relating to a comparison of probabilities, the other to an alleged fact. If both can be maintained, we shall have good grounds for coming to a distinct decision on the merits of the case. Argument will have been heard on both sides in two forms, and the grounds on which the judgment is arrived at will be laid out fairly and openly.

We will then, having the two views before us, put forward two general arguments for maintaining the Traditional view as it has been set forth in the foregoing Address. One of these

arguments shall form the subject of the present Address; the other, and more conclusive argument will be set forth in the Addresses that will follow. These two arguments may be briefly gathered up in the two following statements:—

A. That the Traditional view is intrinsically more probable than the Analytical view.

B. That the Traditional view can, with every appearance of probability, claim the authority of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ.

The first of these statements, into which we may now at once enter, suggests at the very outset some sort of general comparison between the two views, without which we can hardly appreciate the more detailed considerations that will follow. Any careful comparison will be found to show that the two views differ (*a*) in the fundamental presupposition on which each rests; (*b*) in the general character that each presents of the Old Testament history; (*c*) in the design and purpose which each view seems unmistakeably to indicate as pervading and conditioning the history.

(*a*) Of these three fundamental differences, we have already alluded to the first. It is this momentous difference,—that the Traditional view presupposes the supernatural and miraculous, and deals with its manifestations without any apparent consciousness that they could ever be supposed to suggest untrustworthiness in the narrative. In the Analytical view, as we well

know, it is utterly different. Some of the advocates of this view, as we know from their own language, assume from the very first a naturalistic basis, and regard the miraculous as the most certain indication of the unhistorical and untrustworthy, or, as the newly-coined phraseology describes it, of idealized history. Others adopt more modified views, and either minimise, as far as trustworthiness will seem to permit, the miraculous occurrences mentioned generally in the Old Testament, or, at any rate, dispose of the first eleven chapters of Genesis as a product of mental activity, not yet distinguished into history and poetry[1], or in other words as *mythical*.

As this last is one of the assertions of the modified Analytical school, let us briefly consider it.

Mythical, in any ordinary sense of the word, these chapters certainly are not. That they contain ancient, and, as their characteristics appear to indicate, trustworthy traditions[2], we may feel disposed to admit: nay, we may go so far as to believe that they were committed at a very early

[1]See *Lux Mundi*, p. 356 (Ed. x), and comp. Pref. to Ed. x. p. xxviii. note.

[2]This word must not be misunderstood, as if it were merely synonymous with 'myth' or with 'legend.' As here used it means teaching that might not yet have been embodied in writing, though this embodiment probably took place (in this case) far sooner than has commonly been supposed: comp. Lenormant, *Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient*, tome i. p. 18 (Paris, 1881).

period to writing, and,—not improbably under two forms,—were, with other early documents, in the hands of Moses, and were used by him in the compilation of the Book of Genesis. This we may admit; and for this there would seem to be some amount of evidence. Nearly all of the most important matters in those chapters have appeared in similar forms in the traditions of some ancient nations—but with this striking and most suggestive difference,—that the Hebrew record alone maintains, and in every particular is permeated by, an unchanged and unchanging monotheism[1], and further, alone puts forward a true ethical conception of sin and its consequences.[2]

What we have then in these remarkable chapters is a manifestation of a selective inspiration, under which it may be, in the first instance, the Father of the faithful bore away with him from Chaldæa the early and truthful form of the primeval tradition,—a form that at a later period, under the providence of God, was to pass under the inspired revision of that first great prophet[3], who wrote of

[1]The presence of this, not only in the early, but in the patriarchal history, is to Prof. Kuenen a reason for regarding even the patriarchal narrative as unhistorical: see *Religion of Israel*, vol i. p. 107 sq. (Transl.), Lond. 1874.

[2]Traces have been thought to exist in Mazdeism, but it does not seem to amount to more than a recognition of a final retribution: see Spiegel, *Erânische Alterthumskunde* vol. ii. p. 149 sq. (Leipz. 1877).

[3]Comp. John v. 46.

his Lord, and to whom we owe these earliest pages of the Old Testament.

To speak of them as mythical is misleading, and, however ingeniously explained away, inconsistent with the generally received meaning of the word.

But to return: we have shown that the Traditional view and the Analytical view differ in their fundamental presuppositions. That they should also differ in the general character they present of the Old Testament history, and of the ultimate design which they ascribe to it, seems to follow almost as a necessary consequence. It will be well, however, briefly to illustrate each of these further particulars, as they prepare us, from the very first, to recognise the essential and fundamental differences between the two views which we shall afterwards more particularly set in contrast.

(*b*) According to the Traditional view the character of the Old Testament history is perfectly natural and simple. It begins with what may be termed the preliminary and prehistoric. It speedily passes into family history, presenting each leading character with a freshness that seems to tell of contemporary recording, and of a studious preservation of archives, which the growing consciousness of a great and divinely ordered future seemed age after age more distinctly to prescribe. The family history in the fulness of

time passes into national history; the laws that are to bind the nation together are enunciated, and afterwards supplemented, when the entry of the nation into the promised land seemed to require final additions and enhancements. The stream of national history is still represented as flowing onward, but under just such limitations as the tribal separations and the apportioned settlements in a newly occupied and hostile country would be certain to involve. So, for four hundred years, the national history reflects the existing state of the national life, and we have in the Book of Judges just the brief and epitomised record which seems exactly to correspond with the circumstances. With the establishment of the monarchy we pass into a different stratum of the national history. The contemporaneous nature of the record becomes again more patent and defined, and the history of the Covenant people more completely answering to the character which is to be traced throughout of simplicity, fidelity, and truth. Such at least is the character which the Traditional view seems to present to us of the Old Testament history.

But it is otherwise when we pass to the Analytical view. The character of the history presented to us is widely different. The simplicity which we have seemed to trace in it disappears. In its earlier portions it is, according to the theory, highly composite. In its succeeding portions it has become, we are assured, remodelled,

interpolated, and rehandled; and we have no longer to do with the various elements of the unfolding story of a nation, but, almost exclusively, with the efforts of a priestly party, which, at a late period of the national history, were all concentrated on representing the past as authenticating the present,—a present when national independence was fast ceasing to exist.

(*c*) And if the character of the history, under the two views, is thus widely different, so obviously will it be with its purpose and design. Under the Traditional view the whole object of the narrative is to set forth the history of the Covenant people, and God's dealings with the nation from which, as according to the flesh, the Saviour of the world was to come. Under the Analytical view all this becomes subordinated to the one dominant principle of establishing the priestly code, and consolidating priestly authority. All the history of the past has to be modified accordingly; its deep and persistent purpose becomes clouded, if not obliterated, and a purpose placed in the foreground which tends to alter our whole estimate of the essential character of Old Testament history.

These considerations alone would seem sufficient to lead us to decide in favour of that estimate of the Old Testament history which the Traditional view seems distinctly to embody. We must not however forget that against this Traditional view,

plausible as it certainly is, and maintained as it has been from the very time when the Old Testament canon was closed, there are objections which cannot be overlooked,—objections, to the reality of the force of which, the Analytical view owes in great measure the reception it has met with. These objections have emanated, comparatively in recent times, from the critical investigations of some of the most acute and disciplined minds in Europe, and must claim from every candid reader of the Old Testament a full and attentive consideration. This, however, must be borne in mind, that some of the early objections made to the Traditional view do not apply to the rectified form as specified in the second Address. For example, in the Traditional view in its unmodified form, Moses was regarded as the inspired writer of the whole of the Pentateuch. This was distinctly invalidated by the almost certain fact that two or more narratives, different in style and phraseology, *must* be recognised in Genesis, and *may* be recognised, to some extent, in the Books that follow. This, in the rectified Traditional view, is admitted, as far as the Book of Genesis is concerned, and Moses is claimed only as the compiler of it from pre-existing materials, those pre-existing materials being of very ancient date, bearing unmistakeably the indications of a divinely inspired selection, and, as we have already said, having been probably brought by Abraham from Chaldæa. On this and similar

objections, important as they were at the time, we need not now dwell any further. We have simply to acknowledge that here not only was modern criticism right, but that we owe to it, in this particular, clearer views of the structure of one portion of the Old Testament.

I. But it is not so when we pass on to the other leading objections against the Traditional view which we must now fairly consider.

1. It is maintained that large portions of the ritual and ceremonial laws which we find, especially in Leviticus and Numbers (of Deuteronomy we shall speak separately afterwards), cannot possibly owe their authorship to Moses, that they are far too minute to have formed a part of the desert legislation, and must be referred to a much later period of the national history.

In this objection there is plainly considerable force,—a force which any candid mind must feel when reference is made to such a solemn portion, for example, of the Mosaic legislation as that which is described as the Book of the Covenant[1], containing as it does the words spoken by God (Elohim) to Moses, with associated judgments

[1]Exod. xxiv. 7. This portion appears to extend from chap. xx. to chap. xxiv. inclusive. It has been doubted whether the Decalogue is to be included in the Book of the Covenant. Prof. Ladd cites in favour of the inclusion, Exod. xxiv. 28; Deut. iv. 13: see *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. p. 100 note (Edinb. 1883).

(Exod. xxi.-xxiii.), read in the hearing of the people (ch. xxiv. 7), and solemnly accepted by them (*ibid.*). In this Book of the Covenant we certainly find, in apparently close connexion with the Decalogue, judgments containing, not only matter of great moral and religious importance, but precepts that we might at first sight regard as of a very trivial nature. How are we to account for such an association, and that too in a portion of Scripture where we might *a priori* expect to find nothing but what was of fundamental significance? Two answers seem to suggest themselves:—the one, that these apparently trivial matters are specified as illustrations of the wide ethical bearing to which the primary commandments were to be understood to extend; the other, that the apparently incongruous elements were really additions made at a much later period, at one of the so-called re-editings or revisions through which it is admitted in the Traditional view that the Pentateuch and other historical Books did probably pass.

Without attempting to decide between these two forms of answer to the objection, this certainly may be said, that there does not seem anything unreasonable in the supposition that later observances, ritual and ceremonial, may have been annexed to the fundamental Mosaic ordinances, and that the Law-Book, especially in its less important details, may have grown, as we know the Psalm-Book did grow, in the later period of Jewish history.

The objection above alluded to is certainly of considerable force, but it does not lie beyond the reach of what may be fairly regarded as reasonable and probable explanation[1].

2. A second important objection is also to be recognised in the apparent fact that, in the long period that ensued between the entry into Canaan and the times of the earlier kings, we find no traces of the observance of regulations of the Mosaic law, even in those particulars which seemed to be prescribed with great legislative stringency,—as, for example, the appearing before the Lord at the three great festivals[2].

The general answer seems reasonable,—that when we take into consideration the circumstances of the occupation of Canaan, and the utterly different state of things between the national union of the wilderness, and the sharply defined local separations in Canaan, we may realise, not only how likely it was, but even how certain it was, that many laws would remain in abeyance, and would only pass out of that state when the national union became again more of a reality; and when, by the establishment of a theocratic centre, the necessarily suspended ordinances could by degrees be put into use and complied with. In regard of the particular law above

[1]See Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. p. 536 sq.

[2]See Exod. xxiii. 14-17. This and other allied objections are dealt with by Dr. Hodgkin in his short but admirable Essay, *Old Testament Criticism*, pp. 18 sqq. (Lond. 1890).

alluded to, it is certainly very worthy of notice that in the chapter in Leviticus (xxiii.) in which mention is made of the great festivals, they are spoken of as 'holy Convocations'[1], without, however, any indication of pilgrimages to some one appointed place being included in the expression. Here again the objection, though at first sight of a serious nature, becomes greatly modified when such an absence of any mention of a definite locality and other circumstances of the case are taken fully into account. Much more might be said, but the nature of these Addresses does not permit us to enter far into the details of these complicated questions. Let this particular objection be urged in the strongest possible form, this answer will always remain,—That there is nothing inconceivable in divinely-guided legislation taking into its purview a period and a state of things in which its regulations both could be, and would be, complied with. It was 'by a prophet that the Lord brought Israel up out of Egypt[2].'

3. A third general objection to the Traditional view, whether in its rectified or its unrectified form, may also be alluded to. It is the very broad and sweeping objection that the Old Testament history is so honey-combed with anachronisms[3],

[1]Lev. xxiii. 37. [2]Hosea xii. 13.

[3]A patent anachronism, very often alluded to, is said certainly to exist in Gen. xxxvi. 31. Even here however there is something to be said on the other side: see Delitzsch, *New Commentary on Genesis*, vol. ii. 247 (Transl.), Edinb. 1889.

contradictions, repetitions, and inconsistencies of every varied form, that a view of its composition such as that which is embodied in the Traditional view, must at once be set aside by every critical student of the Old Testament as utterly outworn and untenable.

That it is so regarded by an increasing number of foreign critics, and by some English writers, must, we regret to say, be frankly admitted; but it may be fairly said, on the other side, that the more the Old Testament history is carefully and impartially considered, the more plain does it become that the tenor of the objection we are now considering is not in harmony with the true facts of the case. The true facts of the case are as follows: first, that only a very small proportion of the alleged anachronisms and contradictions has really been proved to exist; and secondly, that assuming as a fact that such a proportion does exist, its presence can very reasonably be accounted for. Let us remember that we have recognised in several cases the existence of ancient documents out of which the history has been compiled, and further, scattered through all the earlier Books, the presence of explanatory and illustrative notes, some of which may have been inserted at a very early period. The process of compilation and the nature of some of the notes will help largely in accounting for the appearance of several of the more patent anachronisms and contradictions. Repetitions must be expected where

two or more ancient records were before the compiler, and where the combination was effected in some cases by a simple juxta-position of the documents, rather than by that critical fusion of the contents which we now associate with the idea of carefully worked-out history. Lastly, let it be remembered that the narrative of the Old Testament has obviously passed through the hands of a few successive editors, and that it would be simply contrary to all experience not to find that such procedures had imported some amount of divergences and inconsistencies. When we take into account all these circumstances connected with the Sacred narrative, our surprise must be, not that we seem to find these alleged difficulties in certain portions of the history, but that the number of the difficulties which may claim to have a real existence are really so few.

II. But we must now pass to the other side of the controversy. Hitherto we have considered the more important objections that have been urged against the Traditional view. Can it be said that the Analytical view presents no equal or greater difficulties? This it would seem by no means easy to maintain. It does seem hard to believe that for more than two thousand years the Jewish Church and the Christian Church have been wrong in their general views of the composition of the Old Testament, and especially of the nature and character of the Mosaic legislation. Can we regard it as possible that the labours of a handful of scholars

and critics, mainly in the latter half of the nineteenth century, either now have effected, or will effect, a valid reversal of a judgment on the Old Testament which till lately could appeal to the criterion of St. Vincent of Lerins, and point to the counter-signatures of ages of acceptance. But we need not pause on this speculative difficulty, as the practical difficulties involved in the theory itself will be found to be quite enough to enable us to form a judgment on its validity. We may now proceed to consider a few of the leading objections to the Analytical view of the Old Testament.

1. The first objection we have to urge is a general objection which has been fairly expressed by Professor Ladd when he reminds us that the modern theory we are now considering 'leaves the earlier formative and fundamental periods of the history of Israel almost completely without a literature, in order that it may concentrate all the productive energies of the nation in the age of Ezra[1].' We are permitted to believe that there were some floating records, Jehovistic and Elohistic, in the days of the early kings, but when we enquire how far we can rely upon them as containing trustworthy information, either as regards early history or early legislation, we are told by one leading representative[2] of the Analytical view that we cannot

[1] *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. p. 531, Edinb. 1883.
[2] Professor Kuenen: see above, note 1, p. 64.

regard such a history as that of Abraham and the patriarchs, even in its principal facts, as truly historical, on account of the pure and elevated religious views that are found in it; and, in effect, by another, —that the laws that really belong to the Mosaic age are so few as to bear no comparison with the general bulk of the legislation[1]. Now against such views the objections seem really insurmountable. Can we possibly set aside, as we are invited to do, the vivid history of the patriarchs as mythical, or as the product of conflicting traditions, simply because they involve pure ideas of inward religion and spiritual piety? Or again, can we conceive it possible that the countless laws and interlying history which we have been accustomed to associate with the Mosaic period were, after all, simply due to the productive activity of an age separated by wide centuries from the time of the alleged facts? Is it too much to say that thus to crush into the period of the Exile this really vast amount of fabricated legislation and re-written history is so preposterous as to constitute an objection which the very circumstances of the case must show to be not only valid and reasonable, but practically insuperable.

2. Closely allied with this objection is a second of scarcely less force and validity, viz. that the

[1]On the alleged mass of legislative matter that owes its origin entirely to the Priestly Code, see Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, p. 342 sqq. (Transl.), Edinb. 1885.

Analytical view obscures, almost to obliteration, the work, influence, and even the very personality, of Moses. According to the Traditional view, Moses is not only the divinely commissioned leader of the people, but is throughout the watchful and inspired legislator, speaking with the authority of God, enunciating during the long period in the wilderness laws, not only for the varying circumstances of the present, but, with prophetic foresight, for the whole future of the Covenant people,—laws which, even when they were enunciated, might have been dimly felt to be applicable only to distant days and utterly changed circumstances, but were to form the chart, as it were, of national development. In the Analytical view, on the contrary, Moses passes almost into a shadow, and his legislation into a few primal laws and a few covenant obligations. He is admitted to have conducted the Exodus; for this, in the face of the utterances of the early prophets, modern criticism dare not deny, but this is practically all that is left to us of one whom all the traditions, history, and literature of Israel regard as the great prophet who was the founder of the national greatness, and whom every law, rightly or wrongly, claimed as, under God, its author and origin. The actual Moses of the Analytical view is some unknown person or persons who lived ages afterwards in the declining days of the Exile. Does not common sense itself protest against such an

absolute inversion of all historical testimony and all historical credibility?

3. A subsidiary objection of the same ultimate tenor as the foregoing is involved in the refusal to recognise Deuteronomy as owing its authorship, in anything like its present form, to him who speaks in it, in its opening chapters, in his own person, and whose words and ordinances it professes to record—Moses the man of God[1], whom the Lord knew face to face[2]. This refusal is now assumed far too hastily and too triumphantly to be so patently justified by the whole character of the Book as scarcely to need any argument. It is admitted that the substance may have been Mosaic, and even that some ancient written documents[3] *may* have formed the basis of this vivid and remarkable work; but, that it was constructed or, as the phrase runs, 'dramatised,' by some unknown writer in the days of Josiah, is one of those 'established results' of modern criticism which it is deemed to be simply hopeless to deny. In a word, no other belief is to be open to us than this,—that Deuteronomy is simply a republication of the law, some six or seven centuries after its first publication, made by this unknown writer 'in the spirit and power' of Moses, and put dramatically into his mouth[4].

[1]Deut. xxxiii. 1. [2]Ibid., xxxiv. 10.

[3]See Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. p. 529 (Edinb. 1883).

[4]*Lux Mundi*, p. 355 (ed. x).

The objections to such a view are clearly overpowering. In the first place, the claims that the Book itself makes as to its authorship are too distinct and too numerous to be set aside in any other way than by ascribing conscious fraud to the republisher, and a deliberate misuse of the name of the legislator. Early in the Book, Moses is described as declaring the law that follows[1], and appears in the first person as the narrator of the marvellous and providential story. Towards the close the same statement is reiterated[2]. Nay, more, it is expressly said that Moses wrote the foregoing law and delivered it unto the priests, and unto all the elders of Israel[3], and the statement is repeated in language even more definite and precise. Written the words were, and written 'in a book[4]'; and the words that were written embodied the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel at the close of their long wanderings in the wilderness. And then, as if it were to authenticate all, Moses adds his sublime parting psalm[5], and concludes with his benediction on the tribes that were then about to enter into the long promised heritage[6]. If any words can conclusively connect a book with its author these words are verily to be found in the Book of Deuteronomy. If these words are not the words of Moses, then it is only by literary jugglery

[1]Deut. i. 5; comp. ch. v. 1.
[2]Deut. xxix. 1.
[3]Ibid., xxxi. 9.
[4]Ibid., xxxi. 24.
[5]Ibid., xxxi. 30.
[6]Ibid., xxxiii. 3.

and a real misuse of words that the unknown writer can be cleared of the charge of representing his own words as the *ipsissima verba* of another, or, to use plain terms, of conscious fiction.

The importance and especially serious nature of these considerations will be seen in a later Address.

4. Other objections in details may easily be added, such, for example, as the really preposterous conception that the elaborate description of the Tabernacle was simply due to the imagination and invention of the legislator of the Exile[1], or that the writer of Chronicles deliberately falsified the Books of Samuel and Kings[2], when the supposition is certainly as reasonable as it is charitable that this much maligned writer was only guilty of using other sources then extant which might have differed in details from the Books of Samuel and of Kings. Objections of this nature to the assumptions of the Analytical view might be multiplied almost indefinitely, but in an Address such as the present we can only notice the broader and more striking objections, and so we may close with an objection which, if not applicable to all the supporters of the Analytical view may yet be urged very strongly against one of the two main supporters of this unproved and unprovable theory. The objection is this,—that the elimination of the purely predictive element

[1]See Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, pp. 38 sqq., (Transl.) Edinb. 1885.

[2]Wellhausen, *Ibid.*, chap. vi. pp. 173 sqq.

from the prophets of the Old Testament, and the resolution of what is commonly understood as prophecy into sagacious calculation of what might probably take place, is absolutely irreconcileable with the numerous instances in which the prophet does plainly, to use a prophet's own words, tell of events 'before they spring forth[1].'

This objection few will deny to be of a most real and most valid nature. If we are to deny the existence of the purely predictive element in the prophets of the Old Testament, we must be prepared to deny the existence of any bond of ethical unity between the two Testaments. Messianic anticipations become an illusion, and the teaching of the dear Lord Himself fallibility and error[2]. We are in the dreary realm of absolute naturalism. It may be said that few in this country are prepared to follow the Leyden professor to such lengths as this. We may hope that it is so. There are, however, it is to be feared, tendencies to minimise the predictive that may be traced in many of the writings of our own country. We are told, for example, that the predictive knowledge is of the issue to which things tend[3]. This it certainly

[1]Isaiah xlii. 9.

[2]Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, p. 547, (Transl.) Lond. 1877.

[3]*Lux Mundi*, p. 346 (ed. x). It is only just to the writer to say that, though the expression used in unsatisfactory, the note on p. 345 shows that he seeks to strengthen the evidence of detailed prophecies.

is, but it is much more than this. And it is this 'much more' that we may often perceive to be consciously or unconsciously minimised, until, of the two elements of all genuine prophecy, the ethical and the predictive, the second becomes more and more evanescent. It is, in fact, only an illustration of that anti-supernatural current of thought which is now stealing silently but steadily into the theology of the nineteenth century.

Such are some of the leading objections which may be urged against the Analytical view. When compared with the objections against the Traditional view which have been already specified, it will be admitted, I think, by any one who will candidly consider the two classes of objections, that the objections against the Analytical view are of a more fundamental nature than those that have been urged against the Traditional view. The latter class rest more on difficulties in detail; the former on difficulties in regard of general principles. On such matters, however, minds will differ to the very end of time. Where definite proofs cannot be obtained and only probabilities balanced against probabilities, the individual writer can do little more than express his own deliberate judgment. That judgment will certainly be biased, the bias being due to the extent and degree of the recognition of the supernatural. Each side claims to have cumulative evidence in its favour. Each side claims the right of rectifying former opinions. To this last-mentioned claim no

objection can be made; but this certainly may be urged, that the rectifications on the part of the supporters of the Analytical view are far more continuous and persistent than the rectifications made by those who are advocates of the Traditional view. Such continuous rectifications, however, ought not to be found fault with, still less ought they to be made the subject of controversial banter[1]. They are, at any rate, honest admissions of over-hasty generalisations, and, as such, deserve to be respected. The effect, however, is unfavourable to the acceptance of the principles to which they are applied, and suggests the doubt whether finality has yet been arrived at, and whether present results, about which so much undue confidence has been expressed, may not undergo still further rectifications.

Putting all these considerations together, we seem justified in expressing the strong conviction that the thesis which we have endeavoured to maintain in this Address has been maintained, and that the Traditional view is intrinsically more probable than the Analytical view.

[1]As in Cave, *Battle of the Standpoints*, pp. 44 sqq.

IV.

THE APPEAL TO CHRIST.

We now turn to an argument of a very different nature. Hitherto we have considered the details of opposing theories, and the facts on which the two modes of regarding the Old Testament claim respectively to be based. We now turn to a final Authority. We now make our appeal to the Great Teacher, and aver that the view which we have, thus far, shown to be the more probable of the two, on the merits of the case, can, with every appearance of probability, claim His approving authority, and that the Traditional view of the Old Testament can, for its justification, appeal to the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ.

But here, at the very outset, two of the gravest possible questions present themselves, and must, as far as we can do so, be answered in the present Address[1].

The first question is this,—Have we a right to make such an appeal? Is the subject of the composition and of the historical credibility of

[1]This Address was written prior to the appearance of an important article in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October 1891, entitled 'Our Lord's Knowledge as Man,' to which the student's attention may be particularly directed. It may be added that a careful review of *Lux Mundi* will be found in the same valuable periodical for April 1890: see also the number for October 1890, p. 219.

the Books of the Old Testament a subject on which we can, with propriety, appeal to the teaching of our blessed Lord?

The second question is a more difficult one, and may be thus formulated:—Does the doctrine of the Two Natures permit us to ascribe to our Lord in His human nature an intuitive and unerring knowledge in matters relating to the Old Testament which belong to the general domain of research and criticism? Or, to put this really momentous question in another form,—Was the limitation of our Lord's humanity, and the degree of what is technically called His *Kenosis*, of such a nature that His knowledge in regard of the authorship and composition of the Books of the Old Testament was no greater than that of the masters of Israel of His own time?

Till these two questions, the one relating to the rightfulness of the appeal, the other, to the validity of the appeal, in reference to the Old Testament, are fully answered, it is waste of time for us to investigate those individual passages which may appear likely to form a secure basis for our inferences as to the teaching of our Lord on the nature and authority of the Old Testament. Let us begin then with the first question,—Is such an appeal proper and permissible?

1. At first sight it might seem unnecessary to enter into such a question at all. Who could doubt that it is proper and permissible? When we pause

for a moment to recall the plain fact that our blessed Lord either cites or refers to passages in the Old Testament Scriptures probably more than four hundred times[1],—and when we further remember that in many of these He speaks of the Old Testament in a direct and definite manner, the question of St. Peter[2] seems to rise to our lips, and we ask to whom can we go for guidance save to Him Who has the words of eternal life, and Who not only before His resurrection, but after it, in His holy risen body[3], made the Old Testament and its relation to Himself the subject of His inspired teaching. When we call this to mind it does seem strange that we should have to pause and vindicate the rightfulness of such an appeal as that which we are now preparing to make. If those that labour and are heavy laden are invited by Christ to come to Him[4], surely those who are in doubt and difficulty as to the

[1]A full list of the passages in the Gospels in which our Lord either cites from or refers to the Old Testament Scriptures will be found in Archdeacon Denison's *Speech in Convocation*, pp. 33-39 (Lond. 1891). If we exclude passages that are found in more than one of the Gospels, the number of passages and references would appear to be fully what is stated in the text.

[2]John vi. 68. [3]Luke xxiv. 27, 45.

[4]Matt. xi. 28. In this passage the reference is not so much to the labours and burdens of life generally, as to the soul-troubles arising from the burdensomeness of Pharisaic teaching, and its inability to remove the oppression of the consciousness of sin: see Meyer *in loc.*

nature of an integral portion of God's Holy Word may come to Him, nay, must come to Him, if they are to hope to find rest for their souls. I should hardly have dwelt on this had it not been stated by one of our Bishops to a body like that which I am now addressing[1]—that he objected on fundamental grounds to the argument that if our Lord Jesus Christ has virtually asserted a certain character for a certain writing, there is no appeal from His verdict. If the objection to the argument were really valid, then an appeal to the authority of our blessed Lord might be useless and out of place. But is not the argument objected to perfectly sound? It is not certain that in the case supposed there *is* no appeal. Surely there can be no appeal unless we are prepared to take up the startling position that virtual assertions of Christ are to be considered open to challenge. . . . . What is meant by a virtual assertion? If it means that it is an assertion in an indirect rather than a direct form, then, in the case of Jesus Christ, it plainly cannot be challenged, unless we can bring ourselves to believe (which God forbid) that the indirect assertions of Christ may involve fallibility owing to the limitations of His human nature. What *may* be challenged is whether, in what our Lord says, there is a virtual assertion at all. This, in any particular case, may be deemed fairly open to enquiry and investigation,

[1] *Charge* of the Bishop of Carlisle, as reported in *The Guardian* of July 23, 1890, p. 1163.

and when we deal with particular cases, as we shall do in the two following Addresses, then the utmost care will be taken not to claim as virtual assertions what the words, critically examined, may not distinctly evince to be such. But if, on critical investigation, it seems beyond reasonable controversy that a virtual assertion *is* made, then that assertion, if we have every reason to believe that the words are correctly reported,—whether it relates to doctrine, ethics, or to questions relating to the authority or credibility of the Old Testament,—is certainly to be deemed conclusive and incontrovertible.

We cannot then consider that the exception taken to the argument above alluded to can in any degree affect the confidence with which we may appeal to Christ in reference to the nature and authority of the Old Testament. Not only may we appeal but we ought to appeal. What we especially need in these complicated questions, and in the discussion of the subtleties of argument involved in the Analytical view, is the steadying element which a careful consideration of the tenor of our Lord's references to the Old Testament will always be found to impart. It is not pre-judgment that the appeal to Christ brings with it, but rather a due and wholesome reverence which it infuses in our investigations. It reminds us that the place we are entering is holy ground, and that we cannot treat the matter as a mere literary question, or leave it to be worked out by competent critics, and patiently wait for the

result. We must go at once to Christ for guidance, and through the medium of His references to the Old Testament,—references which one of our keenest opponents speaks of as 'furnishing ample material for admiration[1],'—prepare ourselves for making our final choice between the two views of the Scriptures of the Old Testament which we have analysed in the preceding Address.

2. But here we pass into the second and graver question,—Can we rely absolutely and unconditionally on the results of this appeal? Can we ascribe to our Lord in His human nature such an unerring knowledge, in regard of the details of the subject-matter of the controversy, as may enable us without a hesitation or a doubt to accept the conclusions which equitable criticism may deduce from His words? Or, to put the question in another form, and partially in the words of a direct opponent, are we, or are we not, prepared to admit the possibility, on the part of our Lord, of exegetical mistakes? This is really the momentous question. It has received recent answers from contemporary writers of our own Church that are very far from reassuring. One writer has contended for the possibility of 'intellectual fallibility' on the part of our Lord, but has afterwards had the loyalty and good sense to withdraw words which, we are forced to say, ought never to have been written. Another has used

[1]Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, p. 547 (Transl.), Lond. 1877.

language with regard to the circumscription, as it were, of the Word by the human body which opens a wide door to inferences of a somewhat similar nature, and, to say the least, cannot be harmonised with the teaching of St. Athanasius. Another form of the same tendency to minimise the knowledge of our Lord in His human nature is to be recognised in the attempt to place on a parallel the Lord's evincing of no more than the human knowledge of the time, in the realm of science, when He spoke of the sun 'rising,' with His supposed evincing of no more than the same limited knowledge in the realm of history[1]. The comparison, however, is hardly even plausible. In the one member of the comparison, the Lord spoke from what the eye beheld, and as we, who know fully that the sun does not rise, speak to this very hour; according to the other member, the Lord would have to be supposed to have placed limits on His historical knowledge which *we* claim to have overstepped,—and, to use perfectly plain language, to be ignorant of that about which *we* use no conventional language, but distinctly assert that we know.

All these varied attempts practically to reduce

[1]Comp. *Lux Mundi*, p. 360 (ed. x). See also Sanday, *Oracles of God*, Lect. viii. p. 110 (Lond. 1891)—an interesting lecture, but deficient in its realisation of the truth (see below) that the nature of the humanity of the sinless Lord was not, and by the nature of the case could not be, 'on the same footing with that of His fellow-men' (p. 111).

the knowledge of the Lord, in reference to the actual facts connected with the history of the Old Testament, to the level of the knowledge of the times in which He vouchsafed to 'dwell among us,' impose upon us the duty of attempting to return some definite answer to the general question we are now considering. We must face it humbly and reverently, but yet distinctly and without subterfuge, otherwise our appeal to Christ will be in vain; the counter-appeal from Christ's words to Christ's alleged ignorance will be made, and we shall be reminded, as we have been reminded by one of the most able supporters of the Analytical view, that 'with regard to the revered Master must the right of criticism be maintained[1].' In other words, the teaching of Him, 'in Whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,' must be subjected to the testing of the sin-clouded intellect of mortal man.

The confusion of thought on this subject is simply portentous. When, in this very passing year, a Bishop preaching from a University pulpit[2], speaks in one portion of his sermon of the Lord's voluntarily leaving to His human nature its associated limitations, 'its human weakness and ignorance'; and, in another, affirms 'our

[1]Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, p. 547 (Transl.), Lond. 1877.

[2]See *Church of England Pulpit* for March 21, 1891, pp. 135, 138. The two passages, unaltered, will be found in a recently published volume of sermons by the Bishop of Manchester, pp. 36, 48. The italics are not in the original.

Lord's human ignorance of natural science, historical criticism, and the like,' but does not deny 'the *possibility* of the miraculous communication of such knowledge'; and when, still further, he concludes with asserting 'the reality of our Lord's human limitation as well in knowledge as *in moral energy*,'—when we read such things, it does seem that the holy doctrine of the Two Natures does need reiteration and re-enforcement.

Let us then again hear old truths, and for a brief space again tread in the old pathways of Catholic thought.

We may begin with this simple but most vital question—On what does modern thought base its imputation of ignorance to our blessed Lord in subjects such as we are now considering, viz. the real nature, texture, and historical trustworthiness of the Scriptures of the Old Testament? The answer of modern thought is promptly returned,—On the experiences of *our own* human nature. As *we* cannot by intuition arrive at a knowledge of the age, authorship, and composition, of these ancient writings, but can only hope to do so by patient investigation and long-continued critical research, so also must it have been with Christ; otherwise the humanity He vouchsafed to assume would not have been a true humanity, the Incarnation would not have been that true emptying Himself of His divine glories and prerogatives which is involved in the Apostle's significant term. In a word, the reasoning

in this answer is from the characteristics of human nature, *as known to us by experience*, to the characteristics of the human nature of our Lord. If, to use the language of Athanasius[1], 'ignorance is the property of man,' so, it is contended, must it have been in the case of the human nature of Christ. But is such reasoning admissible? It is utterly inadmissible, and for these three weighty and most sufficient reasons.

1. We cannot, logically or theologically, reason from a nature which is confessedly *sinful* to a nature which was confessedly *sinless*. The Word truly became flesh, but it was sinless flesh, flesh such as that of Adam before the Fall. If we knew the characteristics of the human nature of Adam when God created man in His own image, when He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul, then such reasoning might be valid; but, as it is, such reasoning is utterly invalid; and to say that the Lord in His human nature could not know, or rather, did not know, what the modern critic claims to have discovered and substantiated, is simply an untenable assertion. What

[1]*Contra Arianos*, iii. 45; see also § 37. It is one thing to assert that our Lord could 'carry our ignorance' (§ 37), or, in other words, be capable of it in His human nature, and quite another to assert that, in any given matter—such for example as the nature of Holy Scripture—this ignorance did in actuality exist. On the view of Athanasius, see Newman's note on § 45, *Select Treatises of S. Athanasius*, Part II. p. 464 (Library of the Fathers, Oxford 1844).

precisely the nature of Adam, before his Fall, was, in respect of knowledge or nescience, we do not know; but this certainly we do know, that there is no belief vouched for by a greater unanimity of Catholic teaching,—as may be seen in Bishop Bull's famous discourse on the State of Man before the Fall[1],—than this, that our first parents, before their fall, were endowed 'with certain gifts and powers supernatural[2],' and that of these, 'divine illumination or knowledge was a leading grace[3].' Why then may we not believe that our dear Lord, in His purely human nature, had this divine illumination in everything that related to God's Holy Word, and that, in virtue of this nature, and apart from every other consideration, He had that enduring nearness and 'assession' of God[4] (to use the word of St. Basil in reference to our first parents) by which, on any movement of His will, the truth in all its details was at once present to Him. When, for example, He solemnly quoted Deuteronomy in His conflict with the Tempter, may we not believe, simply on the above grounds, that He *did* know the real nature of that which He was quoting?

If we cannot positively prove this from what has been said, may we not assert that we have shown very sufficient reason for not believing the contrary?

[1]Bp. Bull, *Works*, vol. ii. pp. 52-136 (Oxford 1826).
[2]Ibid., p. 82. [3]Ibid., p. 84.
[4]*προσεδρεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.* Basil, *Quod Deus non est auctor malorum*, cap. 6, vol. ii. p. 78 (Paris 1722).

2. But we may go further. Thus far we have only reasoned from the sinlessness of the Lord's human nature, from human nature as He had it in common with unfallen Adam. We may now ask if there was not a mysterious epoch when that human nature must have received a still higher illumination. When, by the banks of the Jordan, the Holy Spirit descended in bodily form on the baptized Lord, and the paternal voice declared that He was the beloved Son in Whom the Father was well pleased, is it possible to conceive that in Him, Who, the Evangelist tells us, returned from the Jordan 'full of the Holy Ghost[1],' there could have been the faintest trace of any nescience with regard to the true nature of those Scriptures which He was about to set forth and to fulfil. Though we may not presume to dogmatize on the spiritual effects of this descent of the Holy Ghost, we may at any rate believe that the earthly elements which the Lord vouchsafed to wear received an unction (to use a simile of Athanasius)[2], and that the Lord in His human nature, in addition to the increase in wisdom of which the Evangelist speaks, did verily receive in His baptism a still fuller spiritual increase, that so, in His human nature, He

[1]Luke iv. 1.

[2]*Contra Arianos*, i. 47. The whole of this chapter (47) deserves very careful reading: see also Newman's note *in loc.*, *Select Treatises of S. Athanasius*, Part I. p. 247 sq. (Oxford 1842).

might be more fully equipped for the conflict that followed, and for all things involved in His Messianic work and in the bringing of the Gospel message to the hearing and to the hearts of mankind.

Without entering further into this profound subject we may certainly consider this as beyond all reasonable controversy—that in the holy and mysterious circumstances connected with the Lord's baptism, we have no mere manifestations of divine glory simply to quicken the faith of the Baptist or of those that might have been around him,—no miraculous incidents to shed a glory on the works and words of the great preacher of the wilderness—no simply inaugural signs of the Lord's entry into His Messianic ministry, but the visible tokens and accompaniments of an endowment of our Lord in His holy human nature for the Messianic office,—an endowment, real and measureless, by the gifts and illumination of the Holy Spirit of God[1].

If this be so,—and who can fairly doubt it?—then have we not, as it were, a second guarantee that the knowledge of the Lord which we are assured by direct statement[2], and by many a verify-

[1]Comp. Acts iv. 27, x. 38, and the note of Meyer on the former passage. 'Henceforward,' to use the language of Dorner, 'by Divine gift His *personal perfection* is ripened into redeeming strength in reference to His wisdom, His knowledge of heavenly things, His holiness, His might and miraculous power.' *System of Christian Doctrine*, § 108. 2, vol. iii. p. 379 (Transl.).

[2]John ii. 24, 25.

ing incident, extended to the then present thoughts and imaginations of men's hearts, included also the recorded thoughts of the past and all that appertained, directly or indirectly, to the form in which they were expressed? Can we draw any imaginary lines of demarcation round these plenitudes of knowledge? Can any arguments drawn from the *Kenosis*, or, in simpler words, from our blessed Lord's vouchsafing to empty Himself of His divine glories and prerogatives, ever be found to justify us in saying in regard of the Scriptures He came to fulfil,—that though He might know, and even thus receive at His baptism a still further knowledge of the ethical and religious nature of the written Word, He could not, as man, know its literary nature and texture as it is now claimed to be known by the criticism and research of the nineteenth century?

If it be urged, and it *is* strongly urged, that unless we are prepared to say this we are opening ourselves to the charge of denying the complete reality of the Lord's humanity, and, at the very least, of perilously approaching the margin of Apollinarian error, is not an answer, after what has been said, readily forthcoming? The charge against us is, that in thus attributing to our Lord, as man, a complete knowledge,—literary, as well as ethical and religious,—of the Scriptures which He referred to and expounded, we are ignoring the very conditions of our human nature, and

infringing upon its reality. What is our answer? That we certainly may be ignoring the conditions of *our* human nature, and of human nature as now we find it, but that it is not human nature in this state which we attribute to the Lord Jesus Christ, or on which we are speaking when we refer to the Lord's humanity. We assert the great truth, which so many are now willing to evade, that our blessed Lord, verily and truly, is *perfect* Man: but perfect Man he would not be; man in his perfection as well as truly God he could not be, if we are to impute to Him our own imperfect, and (so to speak) dis-illumined humanity, and do not steadily recognise the distinctions between the sinless and illumined, and the sinful and darkened, which we have already drawn in preceding paragraphs. Our attitude verily is not Apollinarian, but Athanasian and Catholic. But to proceed.

The two reasons and considerations which we have now stated and briefly discussed appear to be, both of them, valid and of real cogency. They seem to justify the assertion that a fulness of intuitional knowledge must be ascribed to our Lord in His human nature in reference to the Old Testament; and they seem further to show that any inferences that may be legitimately drawn from the declarations of Christ or from His use in argument of the Scriptures of the Old Testament must, at the very least, strongly influence our judgment in deciding between the two views which we have

stated and examined in the preceding Addresses. The more clear and legitimate the inference, the stronger will be the conviction that the decision has been fairly and rightfully made. But reasonable and cogent as the two foregoing considerations may be, there is a third which to many minds will seem still more conclusive, and will go far to render it impossible to believe that in the Lord's holy and perfect human nature there could have been any shadows of nescience as to the true nature and characteristics of those Scriptures which He alluded to, cited, elucidated and appealed to during the whole course of His ministry, and even expounded after His resurrection.

3. This third reason is founded on the Catholic doctrine of the Two Natures and their relations, the one to the other,—relations that are nowhere set forth more clearly or with more persuasive precision than by our own Hooker in the fifth book of his *Ecclesiastical Polity*[1]. The doctrine of the Two Natures, as we well know, is this,—that in the unity of the person of Christ two whole and perfect natures are indivisibly yet unconfusedly united and co-existent[2]. From the closeness how-

[1]Chap. 53, 54.

[2]Or to adopt the full form of words as we find them in the *Definitio Fidei* of the Council of Chalcedon, *ὁμολογοῦμεν . . . ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστόν, Υἱόν, Κύριον, μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον* Routh, *Opuscula*, vol. ii. p. 79 (Oxon. 1840).

ever of this conjunction, though the properties of the one nature are never infused into the other, it is indisputable that both the body and soul of Christ did receive by the influence of Deity wherewith they were united qualities and powers above nature. 'Surely,' as Hooker[1] says in his marvellous simile, 'as the sword which is made fiery doth not only cut by reason of the sharpness which it simply hath, but also burn by means of that heat which it hath from the fire, so there is no doubt but the Deity of Christ hath enabled that nature which it took of man to do more than man in this world hath power to comprehend.' We see this plainly enough in regard of the body of our Lord, in the walking on the water, in the healing virtue that flowed forth at the touch of faith, in the scene of the Transfiguration, and in many other illustrative incidents. We see it, too, in regard of the Lord's human soul,—in His discerning the thoughts of those around Him, and in that knowledge of what was in man which the Evangelists tell us was present with the Lord in all its plenitude. If we admit this,—and not to admit it is to impugn the veracity of the Gospel,—can we refuse to accept the conclusion of Hooker that the human soul of Christ must have had an ever present illumination and, to use his own words, 'must of necessity be endued with knowledge so far forth universal, though not with infinite

[1] *Eccl. Polity*, v. 54. 6.

knowledge peculiar to Deity itself[1].' When we add to this the variously-expressed but distinctly accordant testimony of all the Catholic writers on the Incarnation,—when Athanasius does not hesitate to assert that 'Christ being in the flesh *deified the flesh*[2],' and when Theodoret plainly says that in Christ 'the human power is a partaker of the divine power[3],'—and when these expressions find echoes in all the great writers of antiquity,—can we hesitate for a moment, on the one hand to repudiate that odious form of modern teaching which tells us that in His human nature the Lord was nescient if not fallible? Can we also, on the other hand, feel hesitation or difficulty in maintaining distinctly and firmly this most certain truth, that the Lord Jesus Christ did verily in His human nature not only know all that has been known or can be known as to those Holy Scriptures which He came to set forth and fulfil, but further, that owing to the union of the two Natures, and to the inflowing of divine gifts and powers into His sinless humanity, every question relating to the Scriptures must be considered as finally and for ever settled by Him, whensoever it can be shown, by the nature of

[1]*Eccl. Polity*, v. 54. 7. The admirable precision of this great writer will especially be recognised in this statement.

[2]The words in the original are: ἐν σαρκὶ ὢν ἐθεοποίει (or θεοποιεῖ) τὴν σάρκα, *Contra Arianos*, iii. § 38.

[3]*Eran.* ii. p. 172, cited by Hooker, *Eccl. Polity*, v. 54. 5.

His utterance, that the question must have been really before Him?

The attempt has sometimes been made to set aside these conclusions by the objection that they are but the *communicatio idiomatum* of Damascene in a more guarded form[1], and that if there is any substantial truth in such a doctrine, there ought to be some trace of some operation of the human in relation to the divine, and yet how can that be? How can the divine nature, of which the eternal attribute is the changeless and the unalterable, receive in any true sense whatever, from the human and the alterable? Is not this simply unthinkable? It is *not* unthinkable. Scripture supplies us with one illustration of one communication,—of a form of knowledge, too—of the human nature to the divine nature which, with all reverence we say it, that latter nature could not, in the way mentioned, have acquired. We allude to the mysterious declaration of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews[2], that our great High Priest, 'though He was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which He suffered.' Here it seems clearly revealed, that the Son of God did, through His human nature, acquire a knowledge, experimentally, which as the eternal

[1]On this doctrine, and the reservations under which it must be held (viz. that there is not any mutual participation of both natures, though a co-operation often, and association always), see Hooker, *Eccl. Polity*, v. 53. 4.

[2]Heb. v. 8.

and impassible God it was not possible for Him *so* to have acquired. Other illustrations might be brought, but probably enough has been said to show that the doctrine on which we are relying cannot be set aside by an objection, plausible as it might seem at first sight, as that we have just been considering. No, the doctrine that by virtue of the union of natures the human nature has been replenished by all such perfections as that nature can receive, stands firm and unshaken, and deserves from us, in these questions as to the amount or extent of our Lord's knowledge in His human nature, a far greater recognition and application than it has yet received from the theology of the nineteenth century.

In old times these questions relating to our blessed Lord's alleged nescience or ignorance were keenly debated. Thomists and Scotists took their sides, and with but little practical result. We may see them all, and the singular questions which the acuteness of the disputants on both sides brought up for discussion, in any of the older treatises on dogmatic Theology[1].

[1]For a full and clear statement of the opinions of Fathers and Schoolmen on this profound subject, the student may be referred to Forbes (of Corse), *Instructiones Historico-Theologicae*, Book iii. ch. 19, 20, vol. ii. pp. 110-128 (Amstel. 1702). The valuable note of Dr. Liddon, in his sermon on *The Trustworthiness of the Old Testament* (p. 15), may also be read with great profit.

Into these things, however, it is neither necessary nor desirable for us to enter. Two things we may claim to know, and for our present purpose these are enough: first, that in the one blessed Personality two whole and perfect natures, the divine and the human, were united; secondly, that some form of communication must have existed between the two natures in consequence of this union. The precise extent and amount of the communication between the divine and the human we cannot define: we can only say with Forbes,—'quaenam autem et quousque voluerit Deus Christo viatori revelare, nemo mortalium assequi potest[1].' Notwithstanding, we may draw, in particular cases and with due regard to the subject-matter, very reasonable inferences as to the form the communication might be supposed to assume, and the sort of guarantee it would supply of the truth and trustworthiness of the declarations on the part of the humanity. We may reasonably believe, for example, that if there were any subjects in which impartation of knowledge from the divine might be conceived to be certain and clear, it would be in matters connected with the Holy Scripture. To believe, on the contrary, that a pure and sinless human nature, so open as it would necessarily be to the inflowing of the divine nature, could know no more in regard of the true nature of the Scriptures of the Old Testament than was

[1] *Instructiones Historico-Theologicae*, iii. 20. 42, vol. ii. p. 127.

known by the most learned of the teachers of the time of our Lord, must surely, after what has been said, be regarded by any sober mind as simply impossible.

It is certain from Holy Scripture[1] that there was one thing that, as Man, our Lord knew not, —the day and the hour of the final judgment. This, the Word, as 'the voluntary mirror to Christ as Man' (to use the words of Scotus),[2] did not will to reveal. It is, however, equally certain that there is no other passage in Holy Scripture in which nescience can be legitimately regarded as predicated of our blessed Lord, or by which the principle of the 'communication' which we have discussed could be deemed to be set aside.

But to conclude. We are now, it would seem, in a position to return our answer to the second question,—Whether we can, absolutely and unconditionally, rely on the results of our appeal to the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ in regard to the Old Testament; and that, not merely in its general aspects, but in details of authorship and composition, wherever it can be fairly shown that such details lie included in the Lord's utterances. And our answer must be, *that we can;* for it has been based on three solid considerations, which it may be convenient again finally to specify.

We have seen, in the first place, in reference

[1]Matt. xxiv. 36; Mark xiii. 32.

[2]Cited by Forbes, iii. 20. 42, vol. ii. p. 127.

to the alleged limitation of knowledge on the part of our Lord in consequence of His human nature, that we can draw no inference from *our* human nature as we know it by experience; and that we have not, and cannot have, any knowledge of those higher powers, qualities and intuitions which essentially belong to human nature in its purity. We have further seen that, in the circumstances of the descent of the Holy Ghost immediately after our Lord's baptism, and in the endowment, as we have presumed to deem it, for His Messianic office,—we may reverently believe that His holy human nature received still fuller treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and still more vivid illumination. And lastly, we have seen that the blessed doctrine of the union of the two natures in the one Person warrants the belief of an enhancement of the human nature by the divine, and such an enhancement, so steadfast and continuous, as makes it simply inconceivable that He who had 'the words of eternal life[1],' and had so often the words of the Holy Scriptures on His lips, could actually know less, as to the composition of those Scriptures, than the critic of our own times claims now to know, and to be able to set forth with all the certitude of science. With such cumulative proofs, who can for one moment doubt that our second question has been answered, and that in our next Address and the Address that follows it, we

[1]John vi. 68.

may rightfully and with the most enduring confidence appeal to every utterance of the Lord, whether in reference to the Law or the Prophets, which, when accurately considered, can be shown to bear upon the trustworthiness of the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

Only one lingering objection, so far as I can see, can with any show of plausibility be urged against what has been said. And it is this, that our Lord never claimed to be an infallible or even special interpreter of the Holy Scriptures. It has been asserted, perhaps a little recklessly, that just as the Lord said to the man who came to Him about the division of the inheritance, 'Who made me a judge or a divider over you?[1]' so the Lord would have said in reply to a question about the age or author of a passage in the Old Testament,—'Who commissioned Me to resolve difficulties in historical criticism?[2]' The assertion is scarcely even superficially plausible, as the questions on which we would fain receive the judgment of the Lord are as widely removed from the request of the 'one out of the multitude' as can readily be conceived. Our questions, even if they may happen to relate to age or authorship, are really questions that go to the very heart of the matter. They are questions that relate not to the things of this world, but

[1]Luke xii. 14.

[2]Bishop of Manchester, in the sermon above referred to, note 2, p. 91.

to the things that 'belong to peace,' here and hereafter,—the trustworthiness of the Scriptures and their claims to be received as the inspired Word of Almighty God.

This, certainly, we may concede, that critical enquiries, to use the words of Professor Ladd[1], 'rarely appear to have entered the horizon' of the teaching of our Lord. The passages, however, as we shall see from the two Addresses that will follow, are by no means few in which, though there may be no special and direct teaching on the subject, there is often an inferential teaching of a very suggestive and even conclusive character. It will be seen that our Lord does, from time to time, inferentially return such answers to our enquiries in reference to the Old Testament as may equitably be claimed to be authoritative, and as justifying us in arriving at definite conclusions as to the tenor of His teaching. We cannot, then, assign to the objection any greater weight than this—that it correctly states an admitted fact, viz. that the questions relative to the composition and structure of the Old Testament, which are the subjects now mainly before us, did not form any special and defined part of our Lord's teaching. This comparative silence, however, is no warrant whatever for affirming that our Lord would not have entertained such questions if they had been definitely brought before Him: still less will it justify the denial that

[1] *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. p. 29 (Edinb. 1883).

His teaching does, from time to time, involve inferences and even opinions as to matters of biblical criticism which have the closest possible relation to our present controversies. More need not now be said. The passages in which such inferences or opinions are supposed to be involved, will be specified and carefully analysed, and then be left to speak for themselves.

The question also whether Christ may not in some instances have spoken, either by way of accommodation, or only seemingly and not actually on our present questions, must not be summarily dismissed. The dulness or hardness of the hearts of those to whom He was speaking may be thought to have necessitated forms of expression which may be claimed as resulting from some principle of consideration for the spiritual state of those who were addressed; but here again each place and each passage must speak for itself. This only do we unhesitatingly deny, that the Lord's general teaching as to the Old Testament, and those characteristics of His teaching on the subject which all reasonable interpreters would be willing to recognise, could by any possibility be attributed to any principle of accommodation, in the ordinary sense of the words. That He Who was the Truth and the Light, as well as the Way, could have systematically so taught in reference to God's Holy Word, out of deference to the prejudices or the ignorance of His hearers, is utterly inconceivable.

The teaching of Christ on the subject of the Holy Scriptures must now be ascertained in detail. We have proved that such an appeal as we are about to make to Him is rightful, and that the results can be unconditionally relied on. To that appeal we devote the two following Addresses.

V.

THE LORD'S TEACHING AS TO THE LAW.

We now proceed with the details of the appeal to Christ in reference to the Old Testament. This appeal, we have seen in the foregoing Address that we are fully entitled to make; and we have further seen that the fulness of divine knowledge, which we must ascribe to our Lord and to His teaching, indisputably warrants our accepting as conclusive and final the answers to that appeal, whensoever they can be shown to be either included in, or legitimately deducible from, the recorded teaching of our Lord.

But first of all, what exactly is the tenor of our appeal? Is it not substantially this?—for guidance in our estimate of the view of the Old Testament that is now pressed upon us by modern teachers, and has been set before us, both in its full, and in its modified form in a foregoing Address.

Such is the tenor of the appeal. Now in what form can the answer be given? Can it be otherwise than by the utterances of Christ in regard of the Old Testament, and the deductions that may legitimately be drawn from them? If this be so, then it will at once be seen that the utmost care must be taken in selecting out of the numerous references of Christ to the Old Testament only those that bear directly, or by just and clear inference, on the subject-matter of the appeal. It cannot be too strongly

urged that when we appeal to the words of Christ as authenticating the Old Testament, we must make it clear to demonstration what it is that they really do authenticate. The loose and popular way in which the appeal to Christ's words has often been made has greatly impaired, in many cases, the validity of the argument, and has raised prejudices against the whole nature of the appeal, from which, as we have partly seen in the preceding Address, even writers of high character have not been able to free themselves. The *ad captandum* argument, bad always, is pre-eminently bad and reprehensible in momentous controversies like the present.

We shall have, then, to exercise the greatest care in our selection of the references of our Lord to the Old Testament; and especially to be on our guard against pressing them beyond what they will logically and exegetically bear. The references of our Lord which bear directly on our present controversy are confessedly few; but the references to the Old Testament, and the citations which He vouchsafed to make from it, are very numerous, and these references and citations do indisputably create impressions which are of great subsidiary moment, and often carry conviction where more direct arguments may seem to fail. A few of these impressions, derived simply from a general review of these citations and references taken as a whole, it may here not be inappropriate to specify. They are but impressions, but they are impressions which many of us will recognise as

having exercised considerable influence on our estimate of the real nature and trustworthiness of the Old Testament. Of these general impressions we may mention three or four that seem to bear most upon present controversies.

The first relates to the form of the written Word, and is this:—That the Old Testament to which our Lord referred was practically identical with that which we have now in use. There are, as we well know, many instances in which the exact words as quoted by our Lord are not found in any text. It may even be true, as asserted by a very competent writer, that the text of the Hebrew Scriptures in current use in our Lord's days was not the same in all respects as that which we now have: still the deviations when analysed are of a nature that certainly does not invalidate the general truth of the impression. We may be thankful that the text which we have is as pure as it seems to be. That much, however, remains to be done in this particular department may be perfectly admitted.

A second impression certainly is,—That our Lord's knowledge of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, speaking humanly, was of the most exact and comprehensive nature. This impression is created not only by the numerous citations or references, extending as they do from Genesis to the Second Book of Chronicles, but also by the reminiscences, so to speak, of the Old Testament which our Master's words seem constantly to be bringing home to us.

And, it is worthy of note, that they are reminiscences solely of the canonical Scriptures. Not only is there no citation directly made from the Apocrypha, but, as seems most probable, not even a reference to it, or an echo from its words[1].

A third impression relates to the general aspect in which our Lord regarded the Scriptures which He cited or alluded to. That he regarded them as pre-eminently Holy Scripture, cannot possibly be doubted. This is shown indirectly by forms of reference or citation: 'The Scripture'[2]; 'The Scriptures'[3]; 'The law and the prophets'[4], in reference to the whole of the Old Testament; 'The law'[5], in similar inclusive reference; 'the Scriptures of the prophets'[6], and, on one occasion, somewhat significantly, 'all the things that have been written *through* the prophets'[7]; and lastly, the solemn 'It is written'[8],—these all being known forms of referring to Holy Scripture in the time of our Lord, and certainly implying that as they were regarded by our Lord's contemporaries, so were they regarded by Him.

We may mention yet a last impression which seems

[1]See Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. p. 35 (Edinb. 1883).

[2]John vii. 38, comp. verse 42; x. 55. [3]John v. 39.

[4]Luke xvi. 16, comp. Matt. xxii. 40, and conversely Matt. xi. 13.

[5]John x. 34. [6]Matt. xxvi. 56.

[7]Luke xviii. 31. [8]Matt. iv. 4, 7, 10, al.

produced by a very large number of passages, viz. that there was a divine fulness in whatever was cited or referred to,—something far beyond the letter, depths of meaning really to be found even in what might seem the simplest forms of expression: in a word,—that the Scriptures of the Old Testament were really God's Holy Word, and were so accounted by Him Who referred to them. The Lord's reference to the words 'the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'[1], as having been spoken by God, will occur almost at once as an illustration that perhaps, more than any other, has tended to deepen the impression I am now alluding to.

These are simply a few general impressions. Yet if we paused here, and went no further in our appeal to our Lord on the nature of the Old Testament, would it be easy to resist the conviction that a view of Holy Scripture such as we have considered in the Analytical view could never be in harmony with these impressions? Books, some of them written at a late date for the advancement of the claims and interests of a special class, dramatised compositions, fictitious or re-written histories,—how little could they deserve to be spoken of in the terms or regarded under the aspects in which, and under which, they were spoken of and regarded by the great Teacher. What a conviction just these few impressions seem to bring home to us that He Who came to bear witness to the

[1]Matt. xxii. 32; Mark xii. 26.

truth[1] could never have borne such a witness as that which is implied in what has been already said, if the writings of the Old Testament really were what they are represented to be by modern analysis!

But impressions are but impressions,—though I know not whether in subjects like the present they may not exercise an influence more truly to be depended on than many a formulated argument. At any rate they have their value, and may deserve to be considered as manifestations of a kind of spiritual instinct that cannot wholly be ignored. Still our appeal to Christ must go much further than this; we must leave impressions, and pass onward to those definite statements and inference-bearing utterances which are readily to be found amid the very numerous references of our Lord to the Old Testament.

1. Let us take then, first, that cardinal statement in which, at the very beginning of His ministry, and under circumstances of much solemnity, our Lord distinctly specified His own relation to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and especially to the Law, whether in its more restricted or its more exclusive references. This relation was stated both negatively and affirmatively, in short and precise terms, and corroborated by a further statement marked by a similar directness and precision. The words of our Lord to which we are now referring, as we probably well remember, are from the Sermon on the Mount.

[1] John xviii. 37.

They immediately follow the Beatitudes and the short opening address to the disciples, and form in effect the test for the earlier portion of the Sermon. The words are these: 'Think not that I come to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you,'—observe how attention is solemnly called to what follows,—'till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished[1].'

Words could not be stronger. They were addressed primarily to the disciples, but, as is afterwards clearly indicated[2], to many of the thronging multitude besides. The intention of the words was to prepare for a right understanding of the illustrations which followed; and, it may be, also to check vague hopes of covenant-changes which old prophecy might seem to justify[3], and which actually were imputed to St. Stephen a very few years afterwards[4]. Hence the distinctness and precision of the Lord's declaration. There can indeed hardly be any doubt as to the exact meaning. The only questions that can possibly be raised are in reference to the sense in which the term 'the law' is to be understood, and to the nature of the Lord's fulfilment of it. That 'the law' cannot be restricted to what is now termed the moral law, as contrasted with the priestly, or cere-

[1]Matt. v. 17, 18; comp. Luke xvi. 17.
[2]Matt. vii. 28.
[3]See Jer. xxxi. 31.
[4]Acts vi. 11, 14.

monial law, seems certain, even though the illustrations are from the moral law, as such a restricted use would be contrary to the use of the word in all similar passages in the New Testament. It can only mean the whole Mosaic law,—the books of the law, as every Jew of the days of our Lord would have understood this term to include and signify. Nor can there be much doubt as to the sense in which Christ speaks of Himself as come to fulfil the law. He fulfilled the law when, whether by word or deed, He set forth its innermost meaning and contents,—all in fact that was designed by God when the law was declared,—or the ceremonies, in obedience to His divine word, enjoined upon the covenant-people. Precepts, enactments, ceremonies, types, and symbolical details, all were to have their essential meaning and purpose brought out by the Great Teacher, and to receive their completion and consummation in Him. And from this law thus comprehensive and diversified no jot or tittle was to pass away, until all things should be accomplished and this present age should melt into the age that is to come.

What a revelation; how suggestive and how full of teaching in reference to questions that are now exercising our thoughts. If Moses the man of God, in obedience to the commandment of God, set forth the law in the varied forms in which it has come down to us, in the books which are associated with his name, such a revelation as that which we are now considering becomes conceivable. We can under-

stand that even the ceremonial, as involving the typical, is to lose no jot or tittle of its spiritual reality until this dispensation pass utterly away. Its very typical connexion with Christ clothes it with what might be termed a provisional perpetuity, an endurance till all things be accomplished. God has spoken, and his word, even in what might be considered as by its very nature only for a time and a season, endures as to its essentials and absolute elements. All this we can understand and realise; but it is on the tacit assumption that those constantly recurring words in the Books of the Law, 'And the Lord said unto Moses,' are not to be reduced to a mere liturgical formula, but to be accepted as meaning what they say. Deny this, however, directly or inferentially,—imagine the writer of the Exile using the convenient form of words to introduce what he might have thought Moses would have said if the circumstances had ever come before him,—in a word, adopt the current theory of the Priestly Code, as it has been set forth in a preceding Address, and we find ourselves far in the realm of the unthinkable. That the 'idealizations' of the pious Jew of the Exile should be so spoken of by Him, 'through Whom came grace and truth[1],' must seem, at any rate to all plain believers in God's Holy Word, as beyond the possibilities of our conception. For it to be possible to entertain such a conception, we must first conceive the idealizer to have been inspired to write as he did

[1]John i. 17.

write; but an inspiration that can be compatible with continually attributing to God utterances and enactments alleged to have been made to Moses, when they were due only to an interested writer, who was making use of the great Lawgiver's name, is an inspiration that is outside all reasonable and reverent consideration.

We contend then that the assumptions involved in the Analytical view relating to the origin of the Priestly Code are not consistent with the solemn declarations of our Lord in reference to the Mosaic Law, which we have just been considering. If the Analytical view is to be maintained, much more than the jot and tittle will have to be surrendered to the ever increasing demands of modern analysis.

2. From the relation of our Lord to the Law generally, we may now pass to a brief consideration of two of its precepts from which some inferences may be drawn as to the general question, how far His teaching guides us in our choice between the two views. These two precepts are the law of the Sabbath, and the enactment relative to Divorce,—the two precepts in regard of which there was an enduring dissidence between the teaching of our blessed Master and the rabbinical teaching of the day. In each of these some glimpses may be obtained of divine guidance in the anxious and difficult question which the so-called Higher criticism has forced upon our consideration.

(*a*) Let us take first the precept relating to the

Sabbath, and here select for investigation one passage in which our Lord does seem to treat in a critical manner this distinguishing precept of the Mosiac law. Our Lord's general attitude to questions connected with the Sabbath we know well, but on this we need not dwell in our present enquiry. It may be summed up in the single emphatic declaration, made by our Lord when His disciples were censured by the Pharisees for plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath day,—the declaration, founded on the relation of the Sabbath to man, that 'the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath[1].' This attitude is maintained throughout. What we have however here to notice is not our Lord's authority over the day, but the reasoning which, on one occasion, He was pleased to enter upon in relation to the Sabbath, and the inferences that flow from it in relation to the general question of this Address. Let us recall the circumstances.

At the unnamed festival at Jerusalem, mentioned by St. John in the earlier part of his Gospel[2], an impotent man was healed by our Lord at the pool of Bethesda on the Sabbath day. The performance of this act of mercy on the Sabbath called out a malig-

[1]Mark ii. 28. There is some little doubt as to the reference of the ὥστε. The conclusion would not seem to be drawn from the fact that the Son of man was the Head of humanity (Meyer, *al.*), but from the fact that He was the Saviour of man, and so had power even over that which was primarily designed for the spiritual good of man: see Weiss, *in loc.*

[2]John v. 1.

nant bitterness in the Jewish party which, when our Lord visited Jerusalem some months afterwards at the Feast of Tabernacles[1], appears to have vented itself anew, and to have called forth from our Lord an appeal to the law of Moses of a profoundly instructive character. He alludes to the known fact that circumcision was performed on the Sabbath, when that Sabbath was the eighth day[2], and in doing so he draws a kind of contrast between the sanctity of the Sabbath and the sanctity of circumcision, and the relation of each to the law of Moses. Our Lord, in fact, here passes a critical judgment upon the relation of circumcision to the Sabbath which, when carefully considered, suggests important and far-reaching inferences. He inferentially confirms the narrative in Genesis as to the origin of circumcision[3], and its connexion with what may be termed the patriarchal dispensation; He confirms, also, the fact of its incorporation in the law of Moses[4], and further, by the whole tenor of His argument, implies that the priority of the rite gave it a kind of legislative pre-eminence over the Sabbath. Whenever the eighth day brought the two rites into competition, the Sabbath yielded to circumcision. The rabbinical principle, '*circumcisio pellit sabbatum*,' could actually, in this particular, claim the authority of the Lord Himself.

With the inferences which have been drawn from

[1]John vii. 2. [2]John vii. 22.
[3]Gen. xvii. 10, xxi. 4. [4]Lev. xii. 3.

this remarkable passage as to questions connected with the Sabbath, we are not here concerned, but we are closely concerned with the broad fact that our Lord does in this passage set, as it were, His seal on the reality of patriarchal history. Few as are the words, parenthetical as the reference to the patriarch may be[1], the fact remains, that in a passage of a distinctly critical character our Lord makes this allusion, and further, that in referring to Moses and, by inference, to the Book of Leviticus, in which circumcision is ordained, the personal lawgiver becomes connected at least with a passage in a particular Book,—for here, in the verse we are considering, the context precludes the term Moses being regarded as synonymous with the Mosaic law. When to this we add that, in the verse that follows, our Lord mentions that the object of the exception is that the law of Moses should not be broken, may we not at least say this,—that in the passage we are considering the personal Moses is connected with the law that bears his name in a manner which makes it reasonable to believe that he himself wrote far more of that law than

[1]The purport of this parenthetical clause has been differently explained. The simplest view seems to be that our Lord mentions a well-known fact to show that Moses (to whom the Jews were appealing) himself accepted a system which involved a breaking of the Sabbatic rest. The more common view is that our Lord names the fact to show the greater authority of the earlier law than of the later; so Bengel, Meyer, *al.* This, however, does not harmonise so well with what follows.

modern criticism is willing to admit. In a word, if we adopt the Traditional view the whole passage becomes consistent and intelligible.

(*b*) With the passage relating to divorce we may deal more briefly, as it has not the same critical aspects as the passage that has just been considered. It is, however, of very great importance in reference to the earliest portion of the Book of Genesis.

It will be remembered that, towards the close of our Lord's ministry, we are told both by St. Matthew[1] and St. Mark that the Pharisees put a question to the Lord in the hope, apparently, that He might be drawn into the then current dispute between the schools of Hillel the 'looser,' as he was termed, and Shammai the 'binder.' The answer of our Lord is somewhat differently worded by the two Evangelists, but the substance is the same. According to St. Mark the Lord answers the question by another question, 'What did Moses command you?' and the answer is given, as it only could be given, out of a book with the authorship of which modern criticism assures us Moses had little or nothing to do,—the Book of Deuteronomy[2]. Against this answer, which our Lord treats as really no more than permissive, and as a temporary concession to hardness of heart and a low moral condition on the part of those to whom it was made,—against this the Lord sets the primal state,—'male and female made He them[3]',—

[1]Matt. xix. 3 sqq.; Mark x. 2 sqq. [2]Deut. xxiv. 1.
[3]Mark x. 6; see Genesis i. 27.

and God's primal declaration in reference to marriage, whether uttered through Adam or the original writer,—'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife; and they twain shall become one flesh[1].'

Now whence do these words thus deliberately cited and returned in answer to a formal and momentous question,—whence do the words come? As we well know, from the first and second chapters of Genesis, or, in other words, from a portion of that ancient book which we are now invited to consider as a mythical portion, a portion 'in which,' to use the words of a recent writer, 'we cannot distinguish the historical germ, though we do not at all deny that it exists[2].' Is it too much to say that to derive, from a source in which the historical is indistinguishable, the answer of Christ to such a question as that which was put to him, is to many minds inconceivable? And the more so, as on the Traditional view that Moses was the compiler, or, as those who heard the words would have said, the author, we have just that form of answer that would have materially helped to bring conviction to the hearers, an appeal from Moses to Moses, from the inspired legislator to the inspired compiler or writer of primæval history. That it *was* an appeal of this kind, or was felt to be so by those to whom the words were addressed, we of course cannot assert; but this

[1] Mark x. 7; see Genesis ii. 24.
[2] *Lux Mundi*, p. 357 (ed. 10).

we may presume to say, that it is not, what we must regard the other view to be,—simply inconceivable,—unless indeed we adopt a theory of accommodation which, doubtful at all times, would seem to be doubly so in a case like the present.

3. But we may now pass from the Laws to the Lawgiver. There is, it has always seemed to me, an argument of some little weight deducible from the frequent reference of our blessed Lord to the person and authority of Moses. If we turn to a concordance and eliminate our Lord's mention of the name from incidents or passages which may have appeared in a preceding Evangelist, we shall find, I think, that the name occurs in our Lord's discourses some eighteen times, and in the great majority of cases with a clearly personal reference. He is spoken of by our Lord as having given the law[1], as standing in connexion with historic events[2], as having written of the Lord[3], as being one whose writings stood, as far as belief in them was concerned, on a kind of parity with our Lord's own words[4], and as one about whose command enquiry is made before a question of controversy is answered[5]. If we add to this the fact of our Lord talking with him when he was permitted, with Elias, to appear in glory on the Mount of the Transfiguration[6], and to speak of the decease that the Lord was to accomplish at Jerusalem[7].

[1]John vii. 19. [2]Luke xx. 37; John iii. 14, vi. 32, *al.*
[3]John v. 46. [4]John v. 47. [5]Mark x. 3.
[6]Matt. xvii. 3; Mark ix. 4; Luke ix. 30. [7]Luke ix. 31.

When we fairly consider these intimations of the aspect in which Moses was regarded by our Lord Jesus Christ, we must at once feel how widely different this Moses of the Gospels is from the Moses of the more advanced writers of the Analytical school. The Moses of that school is little more than the great national 'Kadhi' of the wilderness[1], the conscientious judge between man and man, the wise counsellor whose brilliant leadership in the Exodus made every Hebrew turn instinctively to him for help and guidance in trials and difficulties, the founder of consuetudinary law, and the one who by connecting his own family or tribal God[2] with the religious faith of Israel, gave to that faith a national existence and history. Such, according to the Analytical view, is the true historic Moses. The imaginary Moses, according to that view, is the Moses of the Exile, the Moses of the Priestly Code, and, after what has been just set forth—the Moses, not only of the unbroken belief of the Jewish Church, but of the Gospels and of the Lord Jesus Christ. The break to which we have come, in connexion with the history of Moses, between the Analytical view and the testimony of the Gospels, must be pronounced to be complete. We have seen in a former Address that the obscuration of the work of Moses as a legislator

[1]Wellhausen, *History of Israel*, p. 434 (Transl.) Edinb. 1885.

[2]Wellhausen, *ibid.*, p. 433, note,—a particularly painful note to read.

and as the founder of an organised religion, formed an argument of some validity against the Analytical view. We now see what would appear to be a still stronger argument,—the Moses of the Analytical view cannot be harmonised with the Moses of Christ. All this is very monitory. It places very clearly before us the real spiritual peril of being led away by the plausibilities and cleverness of modern criticism, and it seems to tell us very plainly that if we are so led away we must be prepared to reconstruct our *credenda*.

4. Hitherto we have noticed subjects in which we stand opposed, more particularly, to the extreme party. We may conclude with noticing one subject in which all adherents of the Analytical view, the moderate as well as the extreme, are cordially united. The subject is indeed one which it may seem a little presumptuous to propose to re-discuss; as, if there is one point on which it is claimed that all intelligent critics are completely agreed, it is—that the Book of Deuteronomy was never written by Moses. We are told by one writer that 'in all circles where appreciation of scientific results can be looked for at all, it is recognised that it was composed in the same age as that in which it was discovered[1],' viz. in the days of Josiah. Another writer, of a very different tone of thought, tells us practically the same,—'we may suppose,' he says, 'Deuteronomy to be a republica-

[1]Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, p. 9, (Transl.).

tion of the law in the spirit and power of Moses, put dramatically in his mouth[1].' Another writer is quite willing to concede that the laws in Deuteronomy are not inventions, but mostly the direct reproduction of more ancient enactments; but he, like the rest, assigns the composition of the Book to some unknown writer of the age of Manasseh or Josiah[2]. On this point all are agreed, that in Deuteronomy we *may* have Mosaic traditions, but that the actual composer of the Book was some pious unknown Jew, who some seven or eight centuries after the days of Moses, put dramatically into the mouth of the great legislator this republication of the Law[3].

Now it may seem great hardihood to urge any form of argument against such a general consent; still there is plainly something to be said on the other side, when we take into consideration our blessed

[1]*Lux Mundi*, p. 355 (ed. x).

[2]Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 82 (Edinb. 1891). It may be right here to notice that this Charge was written, and indeed in print, prior to the appearance of the carefully constructed, and calmly reasoned volume to which reference is here made. Fortunately for the present writer, the learned Professor had stated his general results in a clearly written article in the *Contemporary Review* for February, 1890, to which reference is made in Address II. I thus trust that I have not in any way misstated the general views taken by this most able representative of the English Analytical school.

[3]See, however, the comments of Professor Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 84, in which he speaks of the writer as 'introducing Moses in the third person.'

Lord's references to this particular Book, and the circumstances under which these references were made.

The something that may be said on the other side is this,—that our Lord, on three separate occasions, so referred to the Book of Deuteronomy as to make it morally improbable that the Book could have been so referred to if it had been written, not by Moses, but by one who impersonated him and wrote in his name. Let us briefly consider the three occasions, and see if there is not some ground for the statement that has just been made.

The first passage to which we may direct attention is brief, but of very great importance. It occurs in the concluding portion of our Lord's address to the Jews after His miracle at the pool of Bethesda[1]. In this address, after telling His hearers that if they were believers in Moses they would be believers in Himself, He adds these confirmatory words,—'For he wrote of Me[2].' Now in these words, it may be said, that there is no doubt that our Lord is referring to the striking Messianic prophecy in the Book of Deuteronomy, in which Moses is represented as having solemnly declared unto 'all Israel'[3] that the Lord their God will raise up unto them a prophet from the midst of them, of their brethren, like unto him that was speaking to them[4].' The reference of our

[1]John v. 46. [2]Verse 46. [3]Deut. v. 1.
[4]Deut. xviii. 15. This passage is also referred to by St. Peter (Acts iii. 22), and by St. Stephen (Acts vii. 37).

blessed Lord is however not to be confined to this passage. Every type and typical ceremony in which the Messiah was prefigured in the Mosaic ritual must be deemed to be included in the declaration; but that this particular passage was at the time pre-eminently present to the thoughts of our Lord may with all reverence be regarded not only as probable, but as certain. And for this reason,—that this prophecy was a direct communication from God. For it must not be forgotten that it is stated by the writer that God communicated to him almost word for word this unique utterance[1]. The prophecy of the writer is simply a re-utterance of the all but *ipsissima verba* of Almighty God.

Now, under these circumstances, is it thinkable that the writer could have been any other than Moses? Does it not seem almost beyond controversy that our Lord's words must be taken to the letter, and as setting the seal to our belief that Moses, and no other than Moses, wrote, at any rate, this portion? Would the dramatiser, who, if he existed, was *ex hypothesi*, a devout and God-fearing Jew, have dared to declare that God had so spoken, unless he had known that it was so? And how could he have known that it was so, save by direct communication from God? And what right have we for supposing that he did so receive it, and was thus a distinct medium of divine revelation? If this is not maintained, the only possible supposition that seems left

[1]Deut. xviii. 17.

is, that the Deuteronomist dramatiser had some writing of Moses before him—for the words '*wrote* of Me' seem to preclude tradition—in which this prophecy and its dependence on divine authority was distinctly specified. But if, whenever pressed by what seems fair argument, the critic has to take refuge in these helping-out hypotheses, it does not seem unreasonable to doubt the validity of the theory which these hypotheses are called out to support. At any rate the case stands thus. Our blessed Lord definitely says that Moses wrote of Him; and the tenor of the passage precludes the possibility of the word Moses being taken to mean aught else than the personal Legislator. Now in the Book of Deuteronomy a striking and unique passage is found, in which it is generally admitted that Moses does refer to our Lord. The question then appears finally to assume the following form,—Which is the more probable, that Moses, who wrote the passage, wrote the Book (excepting of course the last chapter) in which the passage is found; or that an unknown writer, impersonating Moses, should have happened to have had a written document of Moses, from which he inserted the passage? Few, we think, could hesitate as to the answer to the question.

There is not, I believe, any other passage in which our Lord mentions the name of Moses in reference, direct or indirect, to the Book of Deuteronomy. But passages there are in which our Lord refers to or makes citations from it, which it seems almost im-

possible to think He would have made if the Book was simply the work of a dramatiser. When, for example, the designedly ensnaring question was put to Him as to the quality of the commandment that entitled it to be counted as the great or the first commandment[1], is it reasonable to suppose that He would have made (according to St. Matthew) a nearly exact citation of two solemn verses of Deuteronomy[2], if the Book had been the late formed composition or fabrication which it is alleged to be. Such a supposition seems, to use the lightest form of words, to jar with our moral convictions.

Still more will this be felt if we take into full consideration the circumstances of our Lord's Temptation, and of His use of the Book of Deuteronomy in His personal conflict with the Tempter. All the circumstances of those forty days of conflict have not been revealed to us; but this we do know, that at their close, most probably on the last of the days, three culminating temptations were directed against our Incarnate Lord, alike in His body, soul, and spirit; and we know, too, that each was repelled, simply and conclusively, by a passage from the written Word of God. And from what part of Holy Scripture did the three passages or parts come? Each one, as we well know, came from this Book of Deuteronomy. Two of the passages came from the 6th

[1]Matt. xxii. 36 sq.; Mark xii. 29 sq. Observe in each passage the term *ποία*, as marking precisely the nature of the question.

[2]Deut. vi. 4, 5.

chapter[1], and one from the 8th chapter[2]—all three purporting to form part of the second solemn address delivered by Moses to all Israel in the land of Moab. Each is introduced by our Lord with the solemn 'it is written,'—a form of words which, to say the very least, stamps each passage as a direct and consciously-made citation from the Word of God. Each involves an appeal to an authority behind the words which the very Tempter himself not only recognises, but with which he seeks to enhance one of his own temptations.

Such are the three citations from Deuteronomy in the particular case we are now considering,—citations made under the most solemn circumstances that it is possible for us to conceive, and apparently claiming to be integral portions of the inspired Word of God. Can such passages owe their real origin to an idealizing writer of the days of the reformation of Josiah? Is there not something which to most minds would seem to be unthinkable in the supposition that the fabricated and the impersonated[3] could find any place in a scene such as that of the Temptation of our Lord? And the more so, when this subjective argument can be supported by the plain objective fact,—that the unbroken tradition of the Jewish and of the Christian Church has always assigned to the great Lawgiver the authorship of the first thirty-three chapters of this most quickening portion of the Mosaic law. The last word has certainly not yet

[1]Verses 13, 16. [2]Verse 3. [3]Consider ch. xviii. 17.

been spoken in a subject which modern criticism somewhat precipitately claims to have now settled beyond the possibilities of controversy.

We have now considered our Lord's testimony to the trustworthiness of the Old Testament, more particularly with reference to the earlier portions of the sacred Volume and to the Mosaic law. His testimony as to the prophets, and as to the historical events of the Old Covenant, we reserve for the following Address.

As far as we have gone, we appear to have found that our first impressions have been confirmed by subsequent and more particular investigations. Throughout these investigations the tenor of our Lord's references may be equitably claimed as supporting,—it may be indirectly, yet in a manner that carries much conviction—what we have termed the Traditional view of the Old Testament. And this claim our opponents do not seem disposed to reject. Nay, the very fact that assumptions have been made as to the possibilities of a real nescience, on the part of our Lord in His human nature, seems to imply some general belief that the aspect in which He regarded the Old Testament does not harmonise with the aspect in which it is regarded by modern criticism.

Are not all these things full of suggestions, and full also of monitory significance? If the testimony of Christ is what it has appeared to be, then the likelihood of offence being given by a criticism that has to maintain itself by attenuating the real knowledge

of Christ, has become perilously great, and His own words come solemnly home to us: 'It must needs be that offences come, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh[1].'

[1]Matt. xviii. 17.

VI.

OUR LORD'S REFERENCES TO HISTORY AND PROPHECY.

WE now pass to the consideration of our Lord's teaching in regard of the historical and the prophetical Scriptures of the Old Testament, and to the inferences which may be drawn from His teaching as to the trustworthiness of the writers.

Before, however, we enter into the details of this teaching, it will be necessary to make a few preliminary comments.

1. We have now before us two classes of references; the one, to certain facts and events to which our Lord makes brief allusions in His addresses to His disciples and to the Jews; the other, to prophecies relating to Himself and to His Messianic work. From the former of these no very conclusive inferences can be drawn. The historical references or, to speak more correctly, the historical allusions are not in any respect of a critical nature. The twelve or thirteen separate incidents to which our Lord refers seem all specified with the simple view of defining, illustrating, or emphasizing, the subject-matter of the addresses in which they are found. They are not thus necessarily substantiated or authenticated by the fact that reference is made to them, but, as will be seen hereafter in detail, the manner in which the greater part are alluded to is such as to make it improbable

that our Lord regarded them as otherwise than as veritable events of veritable and trustworthy history.

It is, however, otherwise with our Lord's references to prophecy. From almost all of these it will be seen that inferences may be drawn as to our Lord's recognition of the inspiration of the writers and the reality of their predictions. It may be often doubtful whether the words of the prophecy admit of a primary reference, or whether we are justified in admitting a typical view of the words or incidents, and in believing that our Lord did the same. This, however, will not be doubtful,—that our Lord *did* regard the writers to whom He refers as inspired by God, and as speaking predictively. In fact, the words of the first Evangelist 'spoken by the Lord through the prophet'[1] represent the view which was entertained by the Apostles and also by our Lord Himself. This there seems no reason to doubt. It is, however, just what is doubted by some of the more advanced writers of the Analytical school. The authorship of the prophetical books has been for the most part left unchallenged. The dates also at which the different books were written have been in a few instances,—as in the case of the Book of Daniel, and in the second portion of the Books of Isaiah and Zechariah,—the subjects of vigorous controversy, but in the great majority

[1]Matt. i. 22, ii. 15: see Revised Version.

of cases have not been seriously called in question. What has been called in question is the predictive element, whether in reference to national events, or to the Messianic dispensation. Writers like Prof. Kuenen do not hesitate to regard the alleged predictions as simply fallible anticipations of the manner in which those who uttered them considered the Deity must, as a consequence of His character, according to their view of it, act towards nations and individuals[1]. The traditional views of Messianic prophecy are freely recognised as forming a beautiful whole[2], but are gently set aside as having no historical reality to rely on. If appeal is made to the writers of the New Testament, and to their plainly expressed views of prophecy, we are distinctly told that their exegesis cannot stand before the tribunal of science[3]; and if even a higher appeal is made it is respectfully but firmly pronounced to be unavailing[4].

It is, however, right to say that such views have not as yet met with any reception at the

[1]See Muir's Introduction to Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, p. xxxviii (Lond. 1877).

[2]Kuenen, p. 496. [3]Kuenen, p. 487.

[4]Kuenen, p. 547. The grounds on which this far-going writer takes up this extreme view are,—(1) that the Lord's words are transmitted to us in another language than that in which He customarily spoke; (2) that the citations are from another version than that in which He presented them; (3) that the narrators have not always done Him justice.

hands of those who are supporting the Analytical view among ourselves. Still there are signs that increasing difficulty is being felt in regard of definite predictions[1], and that the anti-supernatural bias which is certainly to be recognised in the writings of the foreign exponents of the Analytical view is beginning, perhaps unconsciously, to be shown in this country by writers on Old Testament prophecy.

2. Another general remark that may be made on both the classes of references, the historical and the prophetical, which we are about to consider, is that, with regard to the space of time which they cover, both are distinctly comprehensive. The twelve or thirteen allusions to historical events in the Old Testament begin with Genesis and end with the Second Book of Chronicles, and include allusions to events mentioned in the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Samuel, and Kings. They may thus be considered as samples of our Lord's usual mode of referring to the Scriptures of the Old Testament in His discourses, whether to His disciples or to the Jews. They also seem to suggest that if more of our Lord's discourses had

[1]Consider, for example, the statement of a moderate and learned American critic, who thus writes on the subject: 'We have reason to doubt whether prophetic inspiration ever results in the clear and definite knowledge of some single occurrence which is to take place in the future.' Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. p. 347 (Edinb. 1883).

been recorded by the Evangelists we should have found in them similar allusions to the leading events in the history of the chosen people.

But be this as it may, a general view of the allusions which are recorded would seem to create the impression that the Lord regarded both the earlier and the later events as tradition has always regarded them, viz. as real and historical, and as rightfully holding their place in the truthful annals of the nation. This further may be said, that not one of the references favours the supposition that any of the events might be mythical, or that any might have been re-written by some priestly editor of adulterated history: on the contrary, the obvious simplicity and directness of them all seem unfavourable to any other supposition than that of the reality of the incidents to which they refer.

But this is but impression. If it is to be substantiated it can only be so by a consideration of individual passages.

Much the same might be said of our Lord's references to prophecy. If we include therein both direct quotations and the more distinct allusions, we have more references to the prophetical, than to the historical Scriptures; and if we add to them the references, direct and indirect, to the Psalms, fully twice as many. These references, too, as in the case of the historical references, range over some extent of time. Besides the Psalms, the Books of Isaiah, Hosea, Jonah, Jeremiah,

Daniel, Zechariah, and Malachi, are either cited from, or referred to, sometimes with, but more commonly without, specific mention of the names of the writers. So cogent also and so pertinent are these references, that even anti-predictive and anti-supernatural writers like Kuenen, though they by no means admit that our Lord's uses of prophecy are to be regarded as necessarily free from exegetical error[1], do draw clear distinctions between the references to prophecy made by our Lord and the references made by His Evangelists and Apostles, and do recognise to some extent the wisdom and knowledge with which the great Master made His citations from the prophets of the Old Covenant[2].

We do not, however, dwell upon such recognitions as these. What we now contend for is simply this,—that, as in the case of the historical allusions, the impression conveyed was that our Lord considered the events referred to as real, so, in these references to prophecy considered generally, the impression that seems left upon the mind is that the Lord recognises in the prophets to whom He refers the gifts of inspiration and predictive knowledge, especially in their relation to Himself and His sufferings. This impression we must substantiate, and prove to be correct by considering in detail some of the citations or references which seem more distinctly to reveal the

[1]See above, note 4, p. 139. [2]Kuenen, p. 547.

teaching of our Lord as to Old Testament prophecy. We begin, however, with our Lord's references to History, and will now endeavour to show, from some selected examples, that it is certain that He regarded the events as real, and that, thus far, He may be considered to set His seal to the truth of Old Testament History.

1. The first two examples which we propose to consider relate to that portion of the Book of Genesis which we are told by a recent writer is of the nature of myth, and 'in which we cannot distinguish the historical germ, though we do not at all deny that it exists[1].' The two events are the death of Abel and the Flood.

Now in regard to the first, what historical germ is there about which we can be in any difficulty? We learn from Genesis that the blood of Abel was shed by his brother, and that his blood cried unto God from the ground[2]. To this event two Evangelists[3] tells us that our Lord referred in a rebukeful utterance, most probably in the hearing of the Scribes and Pharisees[4], in which He solemnly declares that all the righteous blood shed on the earth from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah will come upon those to whom these words were more particularly addressed. Now, when we turn to the narrative of the death of Zecha-

[1] *Lux Mundi*, p. 357 (ed. 10). [2] Genesis iv. 10.
[3] Matt. xxiii. 35; Luke xi. 51.
[4] See Meyer on Matt. xxiii. 1.

riah and mark his dying words[1], and the sort of analogy they suggest, with what is said of the blood of Abel, is it possible to doubt that our Lord was placing before those to whom He was speaking two historic circumstances and two historic persons? And are we not justified in saying this,—that the resolution of the history of the death of Abel into myth is out of harmony with the tenor of our Lord's words, and that we can only understand those words as implying that Abel was a person as really historical as Zechariah? If a serious speaker marks off a period of time by the names of two persons, one of whom is historical, is it natural to suppose that the other is mythical? It is certainly far from natural to suppose this in the case of the solemn and realistic words on which we have been commenting.

The reference to the Flood is mentioned by the same two Evangelists[2], and in both with the addition of particulars not recorded in Genesis. The reference apparently forms part of a solemn address delivered by our Lord on the occasion of a question being put to Him by the Pharisees, concerning the coming of the Kingdom of God[3]. In such a discourse we may feel confident that every word and every allusion must have its fullest significance. The details which our Lord drew from the treasury of His own divine knowledge

[1]2 Chron. xxiii. 22. [2]Matt. xxiv. 37 sq.; Luke xvii. 26 sq.
[3]See Meyer on Luke xvii. 26.

could never have been added to the merely mythical or traditional. We are told indeed the contrary. It is said that our Lord suggests by these very additions that He is simply treating the Flood as typical[1], and that we have here a tradition used as a vehicle for spiritual teaching[2]. But is tradition rather than history what we should expect in such a discourse, and in reference to such a subject? Tradition, and embellished tradition, when the question was as to the coming of an event, solemn and real beyond all words—the coming of the kingdom of God? Does not the very principle of homogeneity require that there should be reality,—historical reality in the illustration corresponding to the reality of that which it illustrates? Surely if an event alleged to have taken place in the past history of the world is placed before us by the Lord as typically foreshadowing the greatest and most certain event in the history of the future, it is but reasonable to suppose that the event so typically used was a real event, and was so regarded by our Master.

We may pass from these two events to another which, though not included in the so-called mythical period, has been often regarded as little better than legendary and traditional,—the destruction of the cities of the plain, and the fate

[1] *Lux Mundi*, p. 359 (ed. 10).
[2] Preface to *Lux Mundi* (ed. 10), p. xxxv.

of Lot's wife[1]. Here it is even less possible than in the case of the Flood to doubt that our Lord regarded the event as real, and as forming a truthful portion of truthful history. In His words describing the overthrow, He adopts the language of Genesis, and in the solemnly appended warning authenticates the account of the fate of the lingering woman who perished in the whirling storm, and whose memorial was one of those salt cones which the traveller still finds by the shores of the Dead Sea[2]. It is simply impossible to avoid the conclusion that our Lord *does* confirm the historical truth of the narrative, and that, convenient as it may be found to push backward these illustrations of the supernatural into the region of legend, His use and application of the narrative distinctly forbids it. It may be quite true that the Lord, as a general rule, lays but little stress on the details of the account which He employs; still, in this case, it must not be forgotten that, in regard of the manner of the destruction of the cities, He adopts the very language of the original narrative.

The three remaining instances of references made by our Lord to incidents mentioned in the Old Testament,—all of them, it may be observed, miraculous,—are the appearance of God to Moses

[1]Luke xvii. 29, 32.

[2]See Lynch, *United States Expedition*, p. 143 (Lond. 1858); see also Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, vol. i. 314 (Transl.), Lond. 1883, and comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* i. 11. 4.

in the burning bush[1], the descent of the manna[2], and the lifting up of the brazen serpent[3].

In the first of these three instances we have the concurrent testimony of three Evangelists[4] that our blessed Lord used the narrative to substantiate a doctrine of vital importance. The present case, then, is a case, not merely of passing allusion, but of definite teaching; just one of those cases, in fact, in which we are justified in claiming that our Lord's words are to be considered as spoken with plenary authority, and as admitting no assumption of any accommodative use of the passage. They are spoken too with studied precision,—'in the Book of Moses, in the place concerning the Bush[5],'—and cannot possibly be understood in any other sense than as authenticating the narrative, and the miraculous circumstances related by Moses. We have, then, here an authoritative recognition, not only of the narrative, but, by reasonable inference, of the inspiration and divine mission of Moses.

The second instance[6] is of equal importance. The allusion to the manna is not merely incidental, but forms the typical substratum of the deep teaching in the synagogue of Capernaum of Himself as the living bread, the bread of which

[1]Exod. iii. 2. sqq. [2]Exod. xvii. 14 sqq. [3]Numb. xxi. 8, 9.
[4]Matt. xxii. 31 sqq.; Mark xii. 26 sqq.; Luke xx. 27 sqq.
[5]Mark xii. 26 (Revised Version); comp. Luke xx, 37 (Revised Version). [6]John vi. 49.

he that eateth will live for ever[1]. The allusion to the manna was first made by the Jews. The events of the preceding day and the Feeding of the Five Thousand had turned their thoughts to the great miracle that was associated with His ministry, and they ask, it may be, that the Lord should prove Himself to be their long looked-for Messiah by some analogous miracle which tradition taught them to look for in the Messiah[2]. The answer is contained in all that follows; and in that answer the miracle of the first-given manna is not merely alluded to, but stated in the most definite and unreserved language[3]. That the Lord Jesus Christ here places his seal upon a miracle which modern criticism regards as a story that the Priestly Code has made use of for pressing upon the people the sanctity of the Sabbath, and has spoilt in the using[4],—may be considered as beyond reasonable doubt.

In the third case[5] the allusion is brief, but the circumstances under which it was made, and the deep teaching of the passage where it occurs, render it impossible to take any other view than that which recognises in the words a reference to a real and historical event. According to the best interpretation of the passage, the verse which

[1]John vi. 58. [2]Schoettg. *Hor.* ii. 475 (cited by Meyer).
[3]John vi. 49, 58.
[4]Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, p. 352 sq. (Transl.), Edinb. 1885. [5]John iii. 14.

contains the reference sets forth a second reason and motive for belief in the Lord Jesus, prefacing it by an allusion to an event in the past that had a doubly typical character. The raising up of the brazen serpent foreshadowed the Crucifixion; the healing power which flowed forth to him who gazed on the serpent betokened the saving power of faith in the crucified One. That the whole is only a legendary story, we are confident, will be pronounced by every fair mind utterly incompatible with the fact recorded by the Evangelists, —that it was referred to by our Lord typically to set forth the doctrine of His own ever-blessed Atonement. A legendary story embellished by priestly ingenuity could never have formed the typical background for the Atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Of the remaining references, the most important are those in which our Lord alludes to Elijah's being sent to the widow of Zarephath[1], and to a miraculous event in the history of Elisha[2]. The allusions were made in the synagogue at Nazareth, and in the address of our Lord which followed His public reading of Isaiah. The importance of the allusions is due to the fact, that the record of the ministries of Elijah and Elisha contains many accounts of miraculous events, in some of which even believers have felt passing

[1]Luke iv. 26; 1 Kings xviii. 9 sqq.
[2]2 Kings v. 1 sqq.

difficulties, and all of which have been set aside, almost as a matter of course, by supporters of the Analytical view as utterly unhistorical. The narrative of the life of the first prophet is suffused with the miraculous; and, in the case of the second prophet, not only during his life but even after his death the miraculous clings to him[1]. It is thus of no little moment that our Lord, in His public teaching, referred to events in the life of each of the two prophets in a manner which seems to indicate that He accepted and confirmed by His authority, at the very least in the instances alluded to, the truth of the Scriptural narrative. Such an attestation of a narrative, in parts of which real difficulties have been felt, must cause, in all sober minds, an immediate arrest of judgment. It may not always in itself at once convince, but it never fails to prepare the way for considerations which often bring about a conviction more real and more lasting than is brought about by more direct and more elaborate argument. The simple feeling that He thus believed will often be found to remove almost at once many a speculative difficulty.

Lastly, it is worthy of especial notice, that just those miraculous events which seem more particularly to put our faith to trial—such, for example, as those connected with the histories of

[1] 2 Kings xiii. 20 sq.

Elijah and Elisha, or with the early history of Genesis,—are the events to which, it would seem, our Lord has been pleased more particularly to allude.

2. We may now pass onwards to our Lord's references to prophecy; but before we consider passages which clearly belong to this portion of the subject, it may be well first to notice a well-known and anxiously discussed passage, in which the question turns not so much on the prophecy as on the credibility of the events connected with it. I am alluding, of course, to the passages relating to the Book of Jonah and to the prophet's mission to Nineveh. Careful interpretation will here do something for us.

When we refer to the Gospels we find that our blessed Lord twice alluded to Jonah, once after the healing of a demoniac[1], and once, very briefly, a little later[2], and in both cases in answer to a demand from the Jewish party for a sign. It is only with the words spoken on the first occasion that we are particularly concerned. These are given fully, and, as it would seem, in their original form by St. Matthew. The report of the words in St. Luke's Gospel is more condensed. In both of these passages, however, it is clear that the prophet, and not his preaching, is the sign and the type. His preaching and its results are mentioned, but quite independently, being designed

[1]Matt. xii. 39 sq.; Luke xi. 29 sq. [2]Matt. xvi. 4.

simply to put in contrast the acceptance of the message of Jonah on the part of the Ninevites, and the rejection of the message of One greater than Jonah by the Jews.

How the prophet is a sign is very distinctly mentioned by St. Matthew: 'As Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the fish, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth[1].' With the details and the decision of the question whether 'the heart of the earth' refers to the sepulchre or to Hades, we need not here concern ourselves. The 'three days and three nights' of the Lord's being in the heart of the earth requires in either case the same explanation. And the common explanation seems to be the right one,—that 'the three days and three nights' in reference to our Lord are used, not with any studied precision, but simply in echo of the words in the Book of Jonah[2], and as popularly designating the whole day and parts of two other days, which was the exact period in the case of our Lord, and, for aught we know, may have been so too in the case of Jonah. Thus considered, the time is typical; the belly of the fish is typical; the deliverance of Jonah is typical. And of what? Of the Resurrection, and of what preceded it. On this we may fairly ask this further question:—If the history of Jonah is not only a fiction, but, as a responsible writer has said, a

[1]Matt. xii. 40. [2]Jonah i. 17.

story bearing marks of it as patently as any of the tales in the Thousand and One Nights[1],—if the circumstances are not only improbable but grotesquely so, is it conceivable that such a story would be used by our Lord as a type of His resurrection? Is an unreal narrative,—a narrative which, if interpreted historically, 'justly gives offence[2],' to be regarded as typical of the great and real miracle which is the foundation of Christianity? In a word, is any other view fairly compatible with the nature of the comparison than that our Lord regarded the Jonah-sign as a reality, and the particular deliverance of Jonah as a fact? and if He did so, further critical enquiry is foreclosed. The Jonah-miracle may seem amazing; but still more amazing, if we consider it in detail, is the resurrection from the dead. Our conclusion then is that our Lord was here referring to an historical event, though we have no power of supplying anything, whether from contemporary history or otherwise, which might seem to make the event more readily conceivable to those who have made up their minds to disbelieve it.

We now pass to a few selected instances of our Lord's references to definite prophecy, and more particularly to those that related to Himself.

[1]Dr. Cheyne, in an article in the *Theological Review* for 1877, p. 212.

[2]Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, p. 214, (Transl.), Lond. 1877.

It is however difficult to make a selection, as all our Lord's references to prophecy really convey, almost equally strongly, the same impression, viz. that our Lord distinctly recognised the inspiration of the prophets of the Old Testament, and the predictive contents of their writings, and especially their pervasive references to Himself, His work, His sufferings, His death, and His exaltation. How He regarded the prophets collectively as speaking of these things, we are thrice reminded by St. Luke:—once, before His sufferings, with a detail that brings to the memory the express words of the great prophecies in the latter portion of Isaiah[1]; once, after His resurrection, when He vouchsafed to interpret to the two disciples at Emmaus, 'beginning from Moses and from all the prophets[2],' the things foretold in all the Scriptures concerning Himself; and yet a third time, even more solemnly,—as it was probably immediately before the Ascension,—when, as the Evangelist studiedly records, He opened the mind of the Apostles, that they might understand the Scriptures[3], and particularly those relating to His sufferings and resurrection; so that thus we may rightly say that, in the Lord's last address on earth, the collective testimony of the prophets and of all Scripture formed the subject of His parting and verifying words.

[1]Isaiah 1. 6, liii. 4, 5. [2]Luke xxiv. 27.
[3]Luke xxiv. 45 sq.

And so it was during the Lord's whole ministry. His references and allusions to prophecy were very numerous. Twice He refers to those words of Hosea[1] which characterised all the tenor of His ministry. Twice He cites Isaiah by name; once in reference to the dulness of heart of the nation to whom He had vouchsafed to come[2]; and again, when rebuking the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees, and showing that their very worship was vain in the eyes of God[3]. When He speaks of the Baptist, He refers to Malachi[4], and discloses the true and ultimate meaning of the prophet's words, introducing in them, as He does so, a change which makes the prophet the very mouthpiece of the Eternal Father. When He purges the temple[5], in the few words in which He vouchsafes to give the reason for the act, He refers to two of the old prophets[6]. In His last great prophecy[7] He alludes by name to that one of the old prophets,—I am referring to the prophet Daniel[8],—to whom modern criticism more particularly denies the name of

[1]Hos. vi. 6; see Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7.

[2]Matt. xiii. 14 sq.; see Isaiah vi. 9, and the remarks of Turpie, *Old Testament in the New*, pp. 88 sq. (Lond. 1868).

[3]Matt. xv. 7 sq.; Mark vii. 6 sq.; see Isaiah xxix. 13, and comp. Turpie, pp. 196 sq.

[4]Mal. iii. 1; see Matt. xi. 10; Luke vii. 27.

[5]Matt. xxi. 13; Mark xi. 17; Luke xix. 46.

[6]Isaiah lvi. 7; Jer. vii. 11.

[7]Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14.

[8]Dan. ix. 27, xii. 11.

a prophet, and even of a trustworthy historian[1]; and when He stands before the High Priest and the Sanhedrim[2], He adopts words from the same prophet[3] which all present at once recognise and,—with perhaps two solitary exceptions[4],—wildly act upon.

It is, however, as we have already implied, when His sufferings and death were nigh at hand, that the Lord's references to prophecy became more distinct and emphatic. There are two occasions on which our Lord cites definitely prophetic words under circumstances which preclude the possibility of any other supposition than that He knew them to have a Messianic reference, and cited them accordingly. The first occasion is immediately after the celebration of the Last Supper, when the dispersion of the Apostles was foretold[5]. Here our Lord, significantly changing the imperative to the future[6], uses words from Zechariah[7], which from the manner in which they are introduced ('it hath been written'), cannot be regarded as semi-proverbial, but as a definite reference to prophecy. On the second occasion,

[1]Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, p. 147 (Transl.), Lond. 1877.

[2]Matt. xxvi. 54; Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 60.

[3]Dan. vii. 13.

[4]Joseph of Arimathæa (Luke xxiii. 50, 51), and probably Nicodemus; comp. John vii. 50.

[5]Matt. xxvi. 31; Mark xiv. 27.

[6]See Turpie, *Old Testament in the New*, p. 152 (Lond. 1868).

[7]Zech. xiii. 7.

under the same solemn circumstances[1], our Lord quotes words from the great Messianic prophecy of Isaiah, which He not only applies directly to Himself, but enhances by the further declaration that they *must* be fulfilled in Him, and that 'that which concerneth' Him,—that which the prophet had foreshadowed, and He Himself had recently foretold[2], is having its fore-ordered issue and fulfilment.

This statement of the divine necessity that prophecy *must* be fulfilled in Himself is in truth one of the strongest arguments in favour of the Traditional view of prophecy, especially in its relation to our Lord, that can be adduced. It is a direct testimony on the part of our Lord, of the truth and reality of the Messianic prophecy of the Old Covenant. It is a testimony that was, at least three times, explicitly given;—once in the passage we have already considered[3]; once at the betrayal at the garden of Gethsemane[4]; and once again, after the Resurrection, in even more comprehensive language, when, in the last address on Olivet, the ascending Lord set His final seal on Messianic prophecy in the great authenticating declaration 'that all things *must needs* be fulfilled

[1]Luke xxii. 37; see Isaiah liii. 12. The same words are found in Mark xv. 28 (Auth.), but are rightly omitted in the Revised Version with clearly preponderating authority.

[2]Luke xviii. 31–34; see also Matt. xvi. 21, xx. 18; Mark viii. 31, ix. 32; Luke xxiv. 7.

[3]Luke xxii. 37.

[4]Matt. xxvi. 54.

which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning Me[1].' Nay, we may add to this, if we take what seems to be the natural connexion of the passage[2]; we may reverently say that even on the Lord's cross of suffering the fulfilment of prophecy was the subject of His divine thoughts. The words 'I thirst' were spoken that Scripture might be fulfilled. And when the words of the prophetic psalm[3] were substantiated to the very letter, then all things were indeed accomplished[4]; and with the words of the old Psalmist on His lips[5], He who came to fulfil prophecy, and fulfilled it in all His blessed ministry, fulfilled it with His dying breath.

Only one reference remains to be noticed. It is different in character to all that have been alluded to; and it seems to show that, in one instance at least, our Lord did pronounce a judgment on prophetic Scripture which, when carefully considered, must be regarded as having a very far-reaching significance. The reference is to Psalm cx. (Sept. cix.),—a reference given in substantially the same form by the first three Evangelists[6]. What we may deduce from this passage is this:

[1]Luke xxiv. 44; see *Lectures on the Life of our Lord*, p. 412.
[2]John xix. 28; see Meyer *in loc.*
[3]Psalm lxix. 21.
[4]Observe the carefully chosen word τελειωθῇ.
[5]Luke xxiii. 46; Psalm xxxi. 5.
[6]Matt. xxii. 41–45; Mark xii. 35-37; Luke xx. 41–44.

First, that the Psalm was written by David, and that thus this particular superscription is right. Secondly, that David was here writing by direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Thirdly, that the reference to the Messiah is so distinct, that David may be regarded as consciously speaking of Him[1]. All this seems patently to be deducible from what Professor Ladd justly calls this 'decisive utterance[2].' It is perfectly true that we can draw no inference from this particular case as to the Davidic authorship of other Psalms, or as to the nature of the inspiration of David in other Psalms which we may believe to have been rightly ascribed to him; still the passage stands as a kind of beacon-light, displaying to us what, in one instance at least, was the judgment of the Lord Jesus Christ in reference to Messianic prophecy. Surely with the rays of such a light upon us we may accept the words of an Apostle, and believe that neither this nor any other prophecy ever came by the will of man, but that 'men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost[3].' The attempts on the part of modern criticism to explain away the impression which this memorable passage will not fail to leave on any candid mind, are many, but all singularly hopeless. It may be perfectly true that our Lord is asking a question rather than

[1]Comp. Delitzsch *in loc.*

[2]*The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. p. 63 (Edinb. 1883).

[3]2 Pet. i. 21.

making a statement[1], but if the question is of such a nature that it plainly involves and implies the recognition on our Lord's part of certain facts and truths, why are these facts and truths not to be put in evidence as recognised by Him, and as having the seal of His authority? The true answer to this is,—because it is inconvenient to modern criticism, which has settled that the Psalm is of a very late date, and has no Messianic reference at all.

But is not modern criticism utterly wrong? Let us put this to the test by this simple question:—Is it to be regarded as probable that, if the Psalm had really been of this late date, there was no one in the gathered company of Pharisees to whom the words were addressed who knew that it was so? If this was *not* probable, then why did not some one of these experts at once traverse the Lord's question by the easily made statement that David never wrote what was imputed to him? If, on the other hand, it *was* probable, then can we possibly believe that a metrical fabrication claiming to be a psalm of David and an oracle of God, and challenging attention by setting forth a doctrine so unfamiliar as the Messiah's everlasting priesthood[2], could have crept into the jealously guarded Scripture, three or four centuries after the date

[1] *Lux Mundi*, p. 359.

[2] See Oehler, *Theology of the Old Testament*, § 230, vol. ii. p. 413 (Transl.), Edinb. 1875.

of Ezra's Bible, and remained there undetected? Whatever else may be said of the Scribes, they were certainly careful and jealous guardians of the very letter of the Scriptures.

We are thus, apart from other considerations, forced by common sense to believe that the psalm *was* Davidic, and was known to be so by our Lord and those to whom He was speaking. And we are confirmed in this by what followed. The question produced a startling effect. It raised, on the authority of David, the question of the Divinity of the Son of David; and we read, as we might expect to read, that no man 'durst from that day forth ask Him any more questions[1].'

We have now concluded our examination of our Lord's references to history and to prophecy, and the results at which we have arrived would seem to be as follows.

First, that the impressions conveyed by a general survey of the references to history and to prophecy appear to be substantiated in each case by the more detailed examination. This examination has, we believe, been carried out with fairness and impartiality, and with due regard to recognised principles of Scriptural interpretation. The conclusions to which it leads are certainly,—that the historical references were to real events, and to acknowledged facts in history; and that the prophetical references

[1]Matt. xxii. 46.

imply throughout a clear recognition on the part of our blessed Lord of the inspiration of the prophets He referred to, of the reality of their predictive knowledge, and of the distinctness of their Messianic foreshadowing and prophecies.

It is with these conclusions that we are here more particularly concerned; because if they are correct they do distinctly negative, not merely several of the results of the Analytical view and of the conclusions at which its advocates have arrived, but even some of the ground-principles of modern criticism. This is very plainly felt by the supporters of that movement, and may account for the earnestness and even bitterness with which any reference to Christ is deprecated in matters alleged to belong exclusively to the domain of critical enquiry. We have touched upon this in a foregoing Address, but we may again ask, why are we to be precluded from this reference to the Great Teacher? Had He not the words of eternal life[1]? Did He not come into the world to bear witness to the Truth[2]? If He is the Light of the world, the true Light that lighteth every man, are we to dispense with that Light in a domain where it is more particularly needed? We have seen in this Address the blessed nature of the guidance we receive in regard of God's Holy Word when we turn to Him,—the freshness, the freedom, the life that breathes through His teaching of that

[1]John vi. 68. [2]Ibid., xviii. 37.

Word; how events and facts seem quickened with a new life when He alludes to them, and how the sure word of prophecy is made more sure to us when He is the interpreter. The more we enter into detail the more vividly is all this impressed upon us.

We conclude, then, this Address with the hope, and indeed the belief, not only that we have substantiated that which we have sought to substantiate—not only that we have shown that many of the results of modern criticism in reference to God's Holy Word are inconsistent with the teaching of Christ, but that we have also incidentally demonstrated the rightfulness of the appeal to *Christus comprobator*.

VII.

CONCLUSION.

We have now concluded our consideration of the momentous subject which I have felt it my duty to bring before the clergy and laity of the two Archdeaconries at the present Visitation. I have followed the outline sketched out in the opening Address, and have, I trust, placed clearly before those to whom the separate Addresses have been delivered the different subjects which must be included in any discussion on the trustworthiness of the Old Testament.

What now remains to be done is very briefly to recapitulate; to gather up the results at which we have arrived, and to draw a few deductions which may fairly be drawn from them, and may afford some guidance, whether monitory or directive, in the grave controversy into which the imprudence of fellow-churchmen has unhappily involved us.

The circumstances which have necessitated the choice of the subject we have reviewed in the opening Address. It has been there proved to us beyond, I trust, the possibility of dispute, that the necessity is real and urgent. Had I not felt it to be so, I should not, on this occasion, have chosen such a subject as the present, involving, as it has done, long-continued study, widely extended reading, and closely applied thought, when there is so much of a simpler and more

practical nature that may seem to be inviting our attention. But when views of the Old Testament, such as we have discussed in the foregoing Addresses, have been put forward not merely by opponents, but by earnest members of our own Church,—when we are told that we must be prepared to make considerable changes in our literary conception of the Scriptures[1],—that the earlier narratives, for example, before the call of Abraham, are of the nature of myth[2],—that we may regard the writings of two of the prophets as dramatic compositions worked up on a basis of history[3],—and when, finally, it is asserted that the modern development of historical criticism which teaches us such things leads us, where it is fairly used, to results as sure as scientific inquiry[4], —then surely it becomes a paramount duty to ask if it be possible that these things are so, and that we may teach them and preach them consistently with a belief in the veracities of God's Holy Word.

The need being thus urgent, we next made it our care plainly to set forth the two competing views of the Old Testament,—the Traditional and the Analytical; and then to state as fully as our limits permitted the two arguments on which a choice between the two views must ultimately turn,—the intrinsically greater probability of the truth of the Traditional view than of the truth of the Analytical view, and the claim that the Traditional view can make of

[1] *Lux Mundi*, p. 356 (ed. x). [2] Ibid., p. 357.
[3] Ibid., p. 355. [4] Ibid., p. 357.

accordance with the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ. To this it would have been easy to add the testimony of the writers of the New Testament, but, for our present purpose of reassuring disquieted minds, it seemed sufficient to rest upon a full and valid demonstration of the teaching and testimony of Christ. Before, however, this demonstration could be made, it was necessary to establish the rightfulness of the appeal to Christ, and the absolute certitude of His judgments wheresoever they could be shown to have been either made, or to be justly inferrible. This being done, there remained only to set forth fully and in detail the teaching of the Lord, first as regards the earlier Books and the Law, and next as regards the historical and the prophetical Scriptures. This has now been completed, with a due regard to the consideration that the Lord's authority cannot rightfully be claimed in any given case, unless careful investigation shall have first shown that His words either do express an authoritative judgment, or, as is most commonly the case, can be shown to involve it by a just consideration of the circumstances and the tenor of the passage.

Such is a brief recapitulation of the foregoing Addresses, and of the general current of the argument. We have now to consider the general results we have arrived at, and the teachings and the warnings which they involve. And the first result would appear to be this—that the active principle in the genesis and development of the Analytical view, is

disbelief in, or inability honestly to accept, the supernatural. This has been patent throughout. In some cases it has been distinctly stated at the outset, and made a postulate before any investigation was entered into, or any discussion commenced. Writers like Professor Kuenen have done us unconsciously a great service by honestly avowing the position they take up, and the principles on which they estimate the history or the prophecy that they criticise. They deserve, too, our gratitude for another reason. Having made the avowal, the writer we have mentioned and some others of his school, commonly write in a temperate, and sometimes almost a reverential, spirit, when taking up extreme positions, or carrying, as they often do, their criticism into the very citadel of Christian belief. Only too commonly, as in the case of Wellhausen and others that might be named, a tone is adopted in the criticism of events involving or in any way tinged by the supernatural that is most painful and most repulsive, and is utterly unworthy of the indisputable ability, and unique ingenuity as well as patient industry, that mark especially the writer we have just mentioned. To return, however, to our point,—aversion to, or, to put it in the mildest form, disinclination to accept the supernatural, is the characteristic in a greater or less degree of all the more pronounced supporters of the Analytical view.

In regard of those with whom we are more particularly concerned,—English writers who have adopted

many of the results of these foreign critics, though neither their tone nor their postulates,—it may be fairly said that, if not for themselves yet for others, they have yielded so far to the dangerous bias as obviously to be not unwilling to concede very far too much if by doing so succour could be brought 'to a distressed faith.' And yet it is certain that it will ultimately be in vain, and worse than in vain. The simpler souls in Christ, now startled and shaken by these profitless concessions, will become the distressed many, while the few for whom this perilous venture has been made will inevitably, after a brief pause, find themselves again swept into the current of the anti-supernatural, and borne far beyond the succour of minimising concessions or 'disencumbered' faith. It is frequently said that such anticipations as these will not in the sequel prove to be correct, and that the heady current will at last find its way into the broad peaceful mere; or, to adopt another simile used by a recent writer, that there will be a sort of landing-place at the foot of the inclined plane down which criticism is now passing, where it will of its own accord come to rest[1]. We ask eagerly what this landing-place can be; and we are told that it is the consciousness of the sacred writers themselves,—the consciousness that they are writing under the inspiration to which they lay claim.

But will this arrest the course of modern criticism? Will a declaration such as the familiar 'Thus saith

[1]Sanday, *The Oracles of God*, p. 61 (Lond. 1891).

the Lord,' or 'The word of the Lord came,' or the very frequently repeated 'The Lord spake unto Moses, saying,' impose silence or even reserve on Analytical enquiry? Nay, rather, will it not even the more call it out and stimulate it? The writer of the Book of Jonah begins with the declaration that the 'word of the Lord came unto Jonah'; but have these words prevented the Book of Jonah being denounced as a fiction, or the symbol of the great fish as 'a shrivelled-up myth[1].' When it is said 'The Lord spake unto Moses, saying,' what is it that a singularly sober and impartial writer plainly tells us[2]? Why, that 'an historical statement is made to lend its form to an ethical and religious doctrine,' and that 'such a statement may fitly be subjected to all the tests of accurate history.' No,—consciousness on the part of the sacred writers, however earnestly or emphatically expressed, will never stay the course of modern biblical criticism. Nought will stay it when once inability to accept the supernatural has become a settled characteristic of the soul. If our investigations have helped to bring out more distinctly the close connexion that exists between this so-called Higher criticism and difficulty as to acceptance of the supernatural, they will not have been made in vain.

2. A second result to which we seem led by the

[1]Dr. Cheyne, in *Theological Review* for 1877, p. 215.

[2]Professor Ladd, in his large work, *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. p. 729 (Edinb. 1883).

general course of our argument is this,—that if we accept the Analytical view we must reconstruct our views and estimate of Revealed doctrine, and, generally, of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Let us illustrate this statement in reference to fundamental doctrine as revealed to us in the Old Testament.

Our current view of Old Testament revelation, it may be assumed, is substantially to this effect,—that from the first chapter of Genesis to the last chapter of Malachi, a gradual disclosure is made to us of the nature of Almighty God, and of His dealings, through one favoured race, with the children of men. These dealings reflect from the very beginning redemptive love; and history and prophecy combine in bringing that redemptive love ever more and more clearly home to each succeeding generation. A promise and the evolution of a promise form to the general reader the spiritual substance of the Old Testament, and place all portions of the Sacred volume before him in coherent unity. Redemption through Christ that is to come is the ultimate tenor of the revelation of the Old Testament.—Redemption? But from what? Let us suppose the answer to be, as it ought to be,—From sin, and from death, and from spiritual hosts of boundless evil, 'world-rulers[1],' as an Apostle calls them, of this darkness in which we dwell. But whence is such an answer derived? What event is there in the past, or what series of events, that makes

[1]Eph. vi. 12.

Redemption the fundamental necessity to man that all revelation thus proclaims it to be? The answer, let us hope, will at once be given; the Fall. But is the Fall a fact? One thing is certainly a fact, —that there is radical evil in man's nature; all experience proves the truth of the Apostle's experience that when he would do good, evil was present with him[1]. But how is it so, and why is it so? Does the Fall, if it be a fact, explain this? Let us again hope that the answer will be,—Yes, veraciously and persuasively.

From this sort of questioning addressed, as we have supposed, to the current believer, it becomes at last abundantly clear that on the view taken of the Scripture narrative of the Fall the gravest spiritual consequences will be found to depend. Now we are told, not merely by foreign writers but by English Churchmen, that the narrative of this Fall and the other narratives prior to the call of Abraham are of the nature of myth,—that is, 'of a product of mental activity not yet distinguished into history and poetry and philosophy[2].' But what exactly does this mean when we apply this statement to the Fall? Does it mean that the narrative in Genesis is a typical representation of what takes place in every individual soul,—just as it has been said that our Lord treated the Flood as typical[3],—or does it mean, that though

[1]Rom. vii. 21. [2]*Lux Mundi*, p. 356 (ed. x).
[3]Ibid., p. 359.

to some extent we may recognise symbolism in the narrative, 'the passage,' as Dorner rightly says, 'has to do with the first human pair and their historical fall'[1]? And if it has this latter meaning, why, in the case of an event on which all the redemptive history of mankind depends, has it not been said so with the utmost distinctness by those Churchmen who are commending to us the new criticism? The pronounced advocates of the Analytical view, at any rate, make *their* meaning quite plain. They dismiss the whole as fable, or as the Semitic mode of accounting for the existence of radical evil. The Fall becomes a figure of speech, and our whole view of Revelation, as we have already said, must be reconstructed. Are we to stand ourselves or let others stand upon the brink of an error so perilous as this, and not utter one word of salutary warning?

The result of our foregoing considerations would seem to be this,—that the Analytical view of the Old Testament, if thoroughly accepted, must involve fresh views not only of history, but of vital and of fundamental doctrine, and that any attempt to utilise it for the sake of helping the distressed faith of a few may end, we had almost said must end, in endangering the faith, and, it may be, even the salvation of thousands. If there is any hesitation in accepting the reality of such a truth as the Fall,

[1] *System of Christian Doctrine*, vol. iii. p. 13 (Transl.), Edinb. 1882.

there never can be any heart-whole belief in the realities of the Redemption and the Atonement.

We have touched upon the perils which the advocacy of the modern criticism of the Old Testament may involve in regard of revealed doctrine; we may now notice the difficulties in which it places its exponents in regard of Inspiration.

The view of Inspiration that is now taken by all the more sober interpreters of Holy Scripture is substantially in accordance with what an Apostle has said in reference to prophecy,—'Men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost[1].' Another Apostle, as we shall well remember, speaks of the inspiration breathed as it were into what was written, —a fact as real as the inspiration of the writer, but not lending itself so easily to the elucidation of the essential idea to which modern theology is now more particularly addressing itself. Attention is now primarily directed to the operation of the blessed Spirit on him who either spoke or wrote under the holy influence, rather than to that which was spoken or written. Adopting this mode of regarding Inspiration we may very readily accept the excellent definition of Inspiration given by a writer whose ability and learning I greatly respect, but from whose conclusions I am compelled, in many particulars, very widely to differ. Speaking of the prophets, Psalmists, moralists, and historians of the Old Covenant, Mr. Gore most truly remarks that 'their

[1] 2 Peter i. 22.

inspiration lies in this, that they were the subjects of a movement of the Holy Ghost, so shaping, controlling, quickening their minds, thoughts, and aspirations, as to make them the instruments through which was imparted "the knowledge of God and of the spiritual life"[1].' With the tenor of this passage we may heartily agree, but when we begin to apply it to several particular cases the results at which we seem constrained to arrive are very different from those arrived at by the writer.

Let us take two or three cases which have been already touched upon in some of the foregoing Addresses,—for example, the case of the Book of Deuteronomy, of the Books of Chronicles, and of the Book of the prophet Jonah. And here let us be careful not to impute to those with whom we are now arguing any of the estimates of these Books that have been formed by the thorough-going advocates of the Analytical view. Let us take the view which English Churchmen have taken, and have considered to have been proved plainly and decisively by critical investigations. Let us assume that the Book of Deuteronomy is what is euphemistically called 'dramatic'; or, in plainer words, that it was not written by Moses,—though it can be shown, at the very least, inferentially that it professes to have been written by him,—but that it owes its existence to the literary activity of an unknown writer who lived eight centuries after his death. Let us admit

[1] *Lux Mundi*, p. 342 (ed. x).

that it was the work of a pious Jew who felt that the times in which he lived seemed to call for some more vivid setting forth of the Mosaic law. Let us even suppose that he had something to work upon, some oral traditions, some fragmentary records of words believed to have been spoken by Moses, and that his simple aim was to republish the law in what he deemed would be its most attractive and effective form. Let us make all these assumptions,—assumptions which, it may be said, writers like Wellhausen would reject with a sneer, and writers of the school of Kuenen would briefly tear to pieces as baseless and uncritical,—let us however make them, and suppose them generally to commend themselves to a certain number of sober thinkers in our own Church; yet could the majority of us ourselves believe, or persuade others to believe, that a book written as we have supposed was, in any true sense of the word, an inspired book, or that the Spirit of truth had inspired the writer thus to impersonate the great Lawgiver of the past. Every fresh proof from the contents of the book that it did inferentially claim to be written by Moses would make the case more hopeless. The dramatic republication that we are invited to believe in would be more clearly seen to be, after all, really pious fraud, and the position taken up by clear and reverent thinkers like the late lamented Dr. Liddon would be felt to be more impregnable than ever, viz. 'that unless there be such a thing as the inspiration of inveracity,' we are shut up to the choice be-

tween acceptance of 'the authority of some of our modern critics, and any belief whatever in the inspiration of the books which they handle after this fashion.'

Very much the same language may be used with regard to the modern views of the Books of Chronicles. As we have seen in an earlier Address, we are to believe that they present to us a version of history that cannot be regarded as a true recital of events, but as a recital which had the *imprimatur* of the priestly schools. We have before us the narrative of the Books of Kings, and we can see for ourselves and mark the discrepancies and differences. We are not invited to think that the compiler of the Chronicles had before him a different series of documentary annals on which he relied more than on the narrative of the Books of Kings; we have proofs forced upon us that there was intentional modification. We are not, however, to regard this as conscious perversion, but as 'unconscious idealizing of history[1]' (whatever that may mean), and a reading back into the records of the past the usages and ceremonial of the present. Now taking thus, as we are studiously taking, the mildest and most apologetic view of results of the Analytical criticism of the Old Testament, we are still justified in asking whether reverent common-sense will permit us to believe, if the literary procedure was what it is alleged to be, that we could rightly regard the result as a product of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. An inspiration of the Holy Ghost in writing

[1] *Lux Mundi*, p. 354 (ed. x).

the history of the past or the present we can understand; we can realize an inspiration by which the working out of the will of God may be foreseen in the future; we can believe in an inspiration of reminiscence, and an inspiration of selection, but an inspiration of the idealizing of history, or, in simpler language, of re-painting history, must be pronounced to be, in the case of the great majority of Christian minds, incredible and inconceivable.

It is scarcely necessary to pursue the subject in reference to the Books of Jonah and of Daniel. Of both we have spoken elsewhere. The former we have seen to be regarded even by English Churchmen as a fiction[1], and the other we know to be regarded by modern criticism as a history of events contemporaneous with the writer of them, disguised in the garb of prophecy. But without pressing these expressions of more advanced opinion, we will simply take the more diluted description of these Books as 'dramatic compositions worked up on a basis of history[2],' and content ourselves with asking how it is possible to maintain that if they have this dramatic character it will be no hindrance 'to their being inspired[3],' or rather to their being accounted to be so. If the word 'inspired' means that the Holy Ghost inspired the two writers in the dramatic operations attributed to them, then we may at least say, that the assertion that the Spirit of truth, who leads us

[1]Dr. Cheyne, in *Theological Review* for 1877, p. 214.
[2]*Lux Mundi*, p. 355 (ed. x). [3]Ibid., p. 355.

into all truth[1], was concerned in the working up on a basis of history of these dramatic compositions, must be regarded simply as a statement which, it may be added, it will be found very difficult to sustain.

This tendency to go considerable lengths with the Analytical criticism of the writings of the Old Testament, and then in the sequel to turn round and say that they are inspired, is now becoming very common. Each critic is making his own diagnosis and settling for himself when inspiration is to be attributed to a writing of the Old Testament, however much that writing may have suffered at his hands. A recent writer on the criticism of Holy Scripture makes this perfectly plain. Speaking, we may presume, for himself and the advocates of what he terms 'higher criticism,' he says that, 'We determine the inspiration of the book from its internal character and the voice of the Holy Spirit speaking in it to the believer[2].' In a word, the settlement of the vital question is to be purely subjective. The testimony of the Church, the canonicity of the Book, the judgment of Catholic writers, all become as nothing. The judgment of the individual, on the presupposition that he is qualified to form it, is to settle the question, however doubtful it may be whether the blessed Spirit may have vouchsafed to speak to him hereon or no. Nothing really is more melancholy in this whole con-

[1]John xvi. 13.

[2]Dr. Briggs, in the *American Review* for July, 1891, as cited in the *Religious Review of Reviews* for August, p. 163.

troversy on the authority of Holy Scripture than the reckless manner in which the judgment of that which is declared by an Apostle to be 'the pillar and ground of the truth[1],' is set aside by Christian teachers when endeavouring to find some basis for belief in God's Holy Word. This is the very last result that those English Churchmen who have supported the Analytical view of the Old Testament would wish to see arrived at. When one of them says that 'it is becoming more and more difficult to believe in the Bible without believing in the Church[2],' we may readily perceive that no sympathy is felt with modern individualism, and yet nothing has more helped to call out that individualism than the very criticism of the Old Testament which has been precipitately advocated.

3. We have pointed out two of the leading results at which we seem to have arrived; but one other, and that of far, far more importance than either of those already mentioned—important as they most certainly are—yet remains to be mentioned. And it is this,—that the judgment of our Lord and Master, so far as we have been able to derive it from His use of the Old Testament, His references to it, and the declarations He has made in regard of it, is sufficiently clear to justify us in making the following assertion,—that our Lord's view of the Old Testament is not only consonant with the Traditional view, but may even be regarded as supporting and confirming

[1] 1 Tim. iii. 15. [2] *Lux Mundi*, p. 338 (ed. x).

it; and that in no particular,—or, to use the most guarded language,—in no particular of any real importance, has it appeared to favour the Analytical view. This result, thus expressed, we do not think would be seriously contested by those who are opposed to us. The judgment at which we have arrived in some of the many passages we have examined—though we have done our very best to maintain a strict exegetical impartiality,—may be called into question as influenced by presuppositions, or may be attenuated when subjected to closer examination; still we sincerely believe that what may be called the net result will not be found to be substantially different from that we have defined it to be.

Assuming, then, that it is so, we find ourselves confronted with the serious question,—How are we as English Churchmen, to order ourselves in the present controversy? Some of the answers to this vital question we have already incidentally dealt with in foregoing Addresses, but two answers there are which must now be more particularly considered.

(*a*) The one is that we must believe that our Lord so used human nature and its limitations of knowllege, so restrained 'the beams of Deity' (this expression is Hooker's)[1] as to observe the limits of the historical knowledge of His age. This statement, which

[1] *Lux Mundi*, p. 360. Hooker, however, it may be observed, speaks (with greater precision) of the beams of Deity 'in operation' either restraining or enlarging 'themselves'; *Eccl. Polity*, v. 54. 6.

we have collected with anxious care from the words of the writer to whom we have had frequently to refer, and after those words had received a very necessary revision[1], may now be regarded as the most restrained form of answer which has been put forward by the English advocates of the Analytical view of the Old Testament. At first, to the great disquietude of all parties in the Church, and to the grievous injury of the faith of many of the 'babes in Christ[2],' answers were made by English Churchmen patently asserting or admitting fallibility in Christ; and though most of those answers have been either explained away or retracted, yet it is to be feared that some of them are still permitted to remain, in spite of widely circulated remonstrances. These answers, however, and the answers given by foreign advocates of the Analytical view, we will leave unnoticed, and simply confine ourselves to a brief consideration of the answer in the form in which we have specified it above. Can we, as loyal Churchmen, accept it? The answer, if we admit the validity of the arguments in Address IV, can only be that the doctrines of the sinlessness of Christ, and still more the doctrine of the union of the Two Natures, unitedly forbid the acceptance of words which imply limitation in respect of historical knowledge. We firmly hold with Hooker that the union of natures adds

[1]Up to the fourth edition the words were different, and were very properly altered; see Preface to ed. x, p. xxxiii, and Preface to ed. v.

[2]1 Cor. iii. 1.

perfection to the weaker nature[1], and that the soul of Christ was endued with universal, though not with infinite knowledge peculiar to Deity itself[2]; and we are solemnly persuaded that the assumption that the Lord willed not to know, in His perfect and illuminated human nature, the things concerning the Holy Scriptures, about which mortal man claims to have knowledge now, is inadmissible, and at variance with Catholic teaching.

The erroneous conception that seems to give rise to all such assumptions is this,—that if the Lord in His human nature had this wide-reaching knowledge, that nature would cease to be true human nature, whereas, as it has been well argued, an eye that cannot discern, say, the satellites of Saturn, does not cease to be a true human eye when it sees them by means of its conjunction with a telescope[3]. We are compelled, then, to set aside this form of answer to the general question now before us as to the attitude which, as Churchmen, we must assume in the present controversy. We cannot get behind what has distinctly appeared to be the teaching of Christ in reference to the Old Testament, by assuming that He spoke simply on the basis of the highest knowledge of His own times, and that His nescience does not bar our acceptance of the results of modern criticism in the somewhat modified form in which they are now commended to us.

[1] *Eccl. Polity*, v. 54. 4. [2] Ibid., 54. 7.
[3] See *Literary Churchman* for Aug. 21, 1891, p. 331.

(*b*) The other form of answer to the question that is before us, may now in conclusion receive our careful attention. If we cannot consider ourselves free to accept, we will not say the Analytical view in the form in which foreign criticism presents it,—this being utterly incompatible with the tenor of our Lord's teaching,—but the Analytical view as pressed upon us by English Churchmen, are we to declare that the question is foreclosed, and that the authority of the Lord binds us to repudiate all critical enquiry whatsoever into the composition of the Books of the Old Testament? This surely would be a hard saying on the other side, and hurtful to that reverential study of the Holy Scriptures, that searching of them, that reading, marking, and learning which prepares the way for the fuller understanding and inward digesting of the blessed Book of Life. There is a teaching now about us and around us as to that Book which it is not either reasonable or wise simply to denounce. There is much in that teaching that bears, as we have seen in these Addresses, the sinister mark of disavowal of the supernatural; much that is repulsive, much that may even involve peril to the faith. But there is also in it much that promotes and stimulates that close study of the Scriptures which can never be without ultimate profit to him who conscientiously undertakes it. Happy, however, are they who are drawn to God's Holy Word by higher influences, and are taught by the teaching of the Spirit. Happy, indeed, are they who, from the fulness of a heart-

whole belief, can receive the written word, without a thought rippling the still waters of the soul as to the circumstances under which it holds its place in the Book of Life, or as to the hand that traced it on the roll of prophecy, or on the records of God's revelation of Himself to mankind. Blessed and happy are such, and woe to those who heedlessly or needlessly cause disquiet to those gentle spirits, whether by giving a half-approving currency to criticisms of God's Holy Word, which weaken the trust in its plenary authority, or by concessions which (as we have seen) bring in their train modifications of vital and fundamental doctrine.

Even, however, with such gentle spirits in the foreground of our thoughts, we cannot advocate the attempt to silence this new teaching by the voice of authority, mighty and momentous as we have seen that authority to be. It is wise and it is seasonable, for the sake of those who, with the best intentions, may plainly have been going too fast and too far, to reason gently with them, and to show them what must be the ultimate issue of this plausible and seductive analysis. Arguments from consequences, as Dr. Liddon has impressively pointed out, cannot be set aside with impunity. 'If it be obvious,' as he says, 'that certain theories about the Old Testament must ultimately conflict with our Lord's unerring authority, a Christian will pause before he commits himself to these theories.' The appeal to Christ may be fruitless to those who have deliberately crossed a Rubicon; but in the case

of the great majority the appeal, if wisely and persuasively made, will rarely fail to suggest some hesitation, some reconsideration of theories which are traversed by the teaching of Christ, or by the inferences which immediately flow from it.

The greatest use, however, of the appeal to Christ will probably be discernible in the case of two of those classes which now especially are looking earnestly to us, God's ministers and the stewards of His mysteries, for help and for sympathizing guidance. To the young, in whose hearts the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ is still the ruling influence of the spiritual life, the appeal to Him, in reference to the Books that spake of Him, will always minister light and reassurance. Nor will it be less helpful to that large class of sober-minded but imperfectly instructed believers, who are now, as it were, standing at gaze, startled and shaken in faith by finding the Traditional view of the Old Testament,—for which we have seen in these Addresses the arguments really remain as valid as ever,—either gently set aside, or obscured by statements which honoured names commend to them as vouched for by investigations as precise and as trustworthy as those of science itself. To this class the appeal comes with a force and a steadying power which no other argument for the authority of the Old Testament supplies to us in any comparable degree. The assured fact that the Hebrew Bible, as we have it now, is identical, save perhaps in some few subordinate details of text,

with the Bible as it was in the days of our Lord, and the further fact that strong and clear proofs can be drawn from the recorded words of our Lord that, in what we have described as the Traditional view of the Old Testament, we are now regarding the sacred volume substantially as He regarded it, are indisputably facts on which every disquieted spirit may rest with the fullest confidence,—anchors on which it may securely ride out the gales of passing controversies.

The appeal to Christ, then, is not made with any design of attempting to silence all criticism, or to set aside all thorough-going investigation. We have made the appeal chiefly to reassure, and to forewarn, and to direct. We have made it to reassure those who may have been led to doubt in the truth of the Traditional view. We have made it to forewarn those who may have been attracted by the results of modern biblical criticism that some of these results will be found plainly to be in conflict with the authority of Christ. But, in doing this, we have not failed to direct the attention of earnest students of the Old Testament to many details of biblical criticism which the very appeal to Christ proves to be not only open to us for discussion, but as earnestly needing it at our hands. We have admitted that the Traditional view has been rectified in some particulars, such as the composition of the Book of Genesis, and we by no means refuse to admit that careful research may prove that further rectification may be needed in

other particulars. This we are prepared to admit; but it is one thing to rectify a view in particulars on which it is plain that our Lord has not, directly or indirectly, expressed any kind of judgment; and another thing to advocate a view that is incompatible with it.

The particulars which need futher investigation are many, and have a bearing upon many important and interesting questions. We may name the subject of the language in which the different Books of the Old Testament are written,—a subject on which we have not touched in these Addresses, for the simple reason that on some of the most important questions connected with it the judgment of experts has been greatly divided. If, for example, it be correct, as recently maintained by the Laudian Professor of Arabic in Oxford[1], that there was a well-developed New-Hebrew as early as 200 B.C., widely different from the Middle-Hebrew of Nehemiah, and still more widely different from the Old-Hebrew of the earlier Books, many of the hypotheses of the Analytical view will have to be completely reconstructed; but this cannot as yet be said to be substantiated. If, on the other hand, as is maintained by Hebrew scholars of high reputation, the early editors of the Masoretic text are to a great extent responsible for the similarity of language that certainly seems to pervade the Hebrew Books of the Old Testament, then arguments from

[1]See Margoliouth, *Essay on the Place of Ecclesiasticus in Semitic Literature*, p. 21 (Oxford, 1890).

language become utterly precarious. But this hypothesis is as far from being generally accepted as the former one. To attempt then in such a state of things to argue from language is absolutely futile and inadmissible. There is thus in this department of criticism a wide field for research and investigation.

Other subjects, such as the whole question of the Text,—the Notes in the earlier Books and the historical Books,—the marks of compilation in the Pentateuch and in later Books,—the probability of additions being made from time to time to the ceremonial Law,—the quotations and references in the historical Books, and the consequent relations of the Books to each other,—the genealogies, early and late, and the principles on which they appear to be constructed,—the legitimacy of the inferences that have been drawn from the names of Almighty God,—a clear statement of the alleged Anachronisms and Contradictions,—all these, and others that might be added to the list, are now seriously demanding a far more thorough and systematic investigation than they have yet received at our hands. To such subjects all the best efforts of modern criticism may be safely and helpfully directed. It is on these details that a far fuller knowledge is required before we can hope either to place the principles and conclusions of what we have termed the Traditional view on a secure basis of tested facts, or to maintain a strong position against the increasingly aggressive efforts of the modern destructive criticism.

This destructive criticism, however, need not give us any great anxiety. The real enemies and ultimate levellers of this so-called Higher criticism are they of its own household. For a time there is a kind of union in destructive effort among the adherents of this school of thought, but when any attempt is made to formulate anything of a constructive nature, the union becomes speedily dissolved. Expert is ranged against expert; theory is displaced by theory; hypothesis by hypothesis; until at length the whole movement, that once seemed so threatening, silently comes to rest, and finds its *nirvana* among the dull records of bygone controversies. It has been so with the Higher criticism of the New Testament; it has been so, to some extent, with the attempts to teach and preach a gospel of evolution, and so most assuredly will it be with the destructive criticism of the Old Testament, which is now causing so much anxiety, and has been helped by so many lamentable concessions.

Our efforts to set these things in their true light, and fairly to examine what we have termed the Analytical view, and the concessions that Churchmen have ill-advisedly made to it, are now brought to their conclusion. Much more might be said. But we trust enough has been said to reassure those who may have been disquieted, not simply by the attacks on the credibility of the Old Testament, and the disbelief in the supernatural from which they spring,—for this has been always so,—but by the recent ad-

missions which, confessedly from a good motive, have been made by Churchmen of known learning and piety, in reference to the Old Testament.

To reassure has been my principal motive in preparing the foregoing Addresses. But not the only motive. I have sought also to warn. I have felt, and most deeply felt, the dangers, especially to the young, of accepting theories, ingenious and even fascinating as they may appear to be, of the origin and composition of the Old Testament, which careful investigation may show to be irreconcileable with the teaching of Christ. In the case of all such theories, and indeed of the Analytical view generally, it has been my care to point out whence they originate, and what they ultimately involve. They originate, as we have seen, in most cases from a readiness, if not to deny, yet assuredly to minimise the supernatural; and by the inevitable drift of consequences they commonly end in some form of spiritual paralysis, some enduring inability to lay hold of the life eternal. This downward drift and ultimate issue may easily be traced out. If the theory is irreconcileable with the teaching of Christ, and is fairly felt to be so, the temptation to believe in a possible ignorance on the part of our Lord, becomes in many minds irresistible, and the way is paved for a belief in the possibility, not only of His ignorance, but even of His fallibility,—and so, by dreadful inference, in the possibility of our hope in Him, here and hereafter, being found to be vain and illusory. . . . Most

truly has it been said by Dr. Liddon that there is one question compared with which all these questions as to the Old Testament fade into utter insignificance, and yet it is a question up to which, under the influence of this Analytical criticism, they will constantly be found to lead. That question, to summarize the words of the great preacher, is this, and nothing less than this,—With whom have we to do, here and hereafter, a fallible, or the infallible Christ?

When such a question as this is found ultimately to be raised by the novel criticism that is now being applied to the Old Testament, surely it must be well for all those who may feel attracted by it to pause, seriously to pause, and to take to heart these words of Almighty God, as He thus spake by the mouth of the prophet—'Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls[1].'

[1]Jeremiah vi. 16.

ANOTHER WORK ON THE SAME SUBJECT

Christus Auctor

By Bishop Candler

IS A FULLER DEFENSE OF THE AUTHORITY AND TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

Price, One Dollar

PUBLISHED BY

Lamar & Barton

Nashville, Tenn. Dallas, Tex.
Richmond, Va.

2RN
.75
Q.T.